council on environmental quality

102 monitor

environmental
impact
statements

Volume 7, No. 5
June, 1977

FIVE EXECUTIVE ORDERS ISSUED IN FURTHERANCE OF THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969

The Five Executive Orders issued by President Carter on May 24, 1977 as part of his Environmental Message are reprinted on pages 3 through 10.

HEARINGS HELD TO REFORM IMPLEMENTATION OF NEPA

On June 6-8 state and local government officials and representatives of environmental groups, labor, and industry gave their views on NEPA implementation at public hearings held by CEQ. Transcripts of the hearings record will be available in the CEQ library after June 30, 1977.

COUNCIL MEMBER SPETH DEFENDS CARTER ADMINISTRATION POSITION ON THE CLEAN AIR ACT

A detailed Press Release appears on pages 11 and 12.

CEQ RELEASES STUDY OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS AND NEPA

An analysis prepared by the Council of the delegation of National Environmental Policy Act responsibilities to Community Development Block Grant recipients is reprinted on pages 13 through 35.

UPDATED AGENCY NEPA CONTACT LIST

An updated listing of agency channels of communication on NEPA matters begins on page 36.

CONTENTS

Five Executive Orders 3
Clean Air Act Press Release 11
Community Block Grants and NEPA 13
Updated Agency NEPA Contact List 36
State-County Index of EISs Filed with CEQ During May, 1977 72
Agency Index of EISs Filed with CEQ During May, 1977 79
Statements Filed During May, 1977 85
Cummulative Summary 142
Subscription Information 143

FIVE EXECUTIVE ORDERS

IN FURTHERANCE OF THE
NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969

ISSUED BY PRESIDENT CARTER ON MAY 24, 1977
AS PART OF THE MESSAGE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Protection of Wetlands

Statement by the President Accompanying Executive Order 11990. May 24, 1977

The Nation's coastal and inland wetlands are vital natural resources of critical importance to the people of this country. Wetlands are areas of great natural productivity, hydrological utility, and environmental diversity, providing natural flood control, improved water quality, recharge of aquifers, flow stabilization of streams and rivers, and habitat for fish and wildlife resources. Wetlands contribute to the production of agricultural products and timber, and provide recreational, scientific, and aesthetic resources of national interest.

The unwise use and development of wetlands will destroy many of their special qualities and important natural functions. Recent estimates indicate that the United States has already lost over 40 percent of our 120 million acres of wetlands inventoried in the 1950's. This piecemeal alteration and destruction of wetlands through draining, dredging, filling, and other means has had an adverse cumulative impact on our natural resources and on the quality of human life.

The problem of loss of wetlands arises mainly from unwise land use practices. The Federal Government can be responsible for or can influence these practices in the construction of projects, in the management of its own properties, and in the provisions of financial or technical assistance.

In order to avoid to the extent possible the long and short term adverse impacts associated with the destruction or modification of wetlands and to avoid direct or indirect support of new construction in wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative, I have issued an Executive order on the protection of wetlands.

Executive Order 11990. May 24, 1977

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States of America, and as President of the United States of America, in furtherance of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), in order to avoid to the extent possible the long and short term adverse impacts associated with the destruction or modification of wetlands and to avoid direct or indirect support of new construction in wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. (a) Each agency shall provide leadership and shall take action to minimize the destruction, loss or degradation of wetlands, and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands in carrying out the agency's responsibilities for (1) acquiring, managing, and disposing of Federal lands and facilities; and (2) providing Federally undertaken, financed, or assisted construction and improvements; and (3) conducting Federal activities and programs affecting land use, including but not limited to water and related land resources planning, regulating, and licensing activities.

(b) This Order does not apply to the issuance by Federal agencies of permits, licenses, or allocations to private parties for activities involving wetlands on non-Federal property.

SEC. 2.(a) In furtherance of Section 101(b)(3) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331(b)(3)) to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs and resources to the end that the Nation may attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation and risk to health or safety, each agency, to the extent permitted by law, shall avoid undertaking or providing assistance for new construction located in wetlands unless the head of the agency finds (1) that there is no practicable alternative to such construction, and (2) that the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands which may result from such use. In making this finding the head of the agency may take into account economic, environmental and other pertinent factors.

(b) Each agency shall also provide opportunity for early public review of any plans or proposals for new construction in wetlands, in accordance with Section 2(b) of Executive Order No. 11514, as amended, including the development of procedures to accomplish this objective for Federal actions whose impact is not significant enough to require the preparation of an environmental impact statement under Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

SEC. 3. Any requests for new authorizations or appropriations transmitted to the Office of Management and Budget shall indicate, if an action to be proposed will be located in wetlands, whether the proposed action is in accord with this Order.

SEC. 4. When Federally-owned wetlands or portions of wetlands are proposed for lease, easement, right-of-way or disposal to non-Federal public or private parties, the Federal agency shall (a) reference in the conveyance those uses that are restricted under identified Federal, State or local wetlands regulations; and (b) attach other appropriate restrictions to the uses of properties by the grantee or purchaser and any successor, except where prohibited by law; or (c) withhold such properties from disposal.

SEC. 5. In carrying out the activities described in Section 1 of this Order, each agency shall consider factors relevant to a proposal's effect on the survival and quality of the wetlands. Among these factors are:

(a) public health, safety, and welfare, including water supply, quality, recharge and discharge; pollution; flood and storm hazards; and sediment and erosion;

(b) maintenance of natural systems, including conservation and long term productivity of existing flora and fauna, species and habitat diversity and stability, hydrologic utility, fish, wildlife, timber, and food and fiber resources; and

(c) other uses of wetlands in the public interest, including recreational, scientific, and cultural uses.

SEC. 6. As allowed by law, agencies shall issue or amend their existing procedures in order to comply with this Order. To the extent possible, existing processes, such as those of the Council on Environmental Quality and the Water Resources Council, shall be utilized to fulfill the requirements of this Order.

SEC. 7. As used in this Order:

(a) The term "agency" shall have the same meaning as the term "Executive agency" in Section 105 of Title 5 of the United States Code and shall include the military departments; the directives contained in this Order, however, are meant to apply only to those agencies which perform the activities described in Section 1 which are located in or affecting wetlands.

(b) The term "new construction" shall include draining, dredging, channelizing, filling, diking, impounding, and related activities and any structures or facilities begun or authorized after the effective date of this Order.

(c) The term "wetlands" means those areas that are inundated by surface or ground water with a frequency sufficient to support and under normal circmstances does or would support a prevalence of vegetative or aquatic life that requires saturated or seasonally saturated soil conditions for growth and reproduction. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas such as sloughs, potholes, wet meadows, river overflows, mud flats, and natural ponds.

SEC. 8. This Order does not apply to projects presently under construction, or to projects for which all of the funds have been appropriated through Fiscal Year 1977, or to projects and programs for which a draft or final environmental impact statement will be filed prior to October 1, 1977. The provisions of Section 2 of this Order shall be implemented by each agency not later than October 1, 1977.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this Order shall apply to assistance provided for emergency work, essential to save lives and protect property and public health and safety, performed pursuant to Section 305 and 306 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 (88 Stat. 148, 42 U.S.C. 5145 and 5146).

SEC. 10. To the extent the provisions of Sections 2 and 5 of this Order are applicable to projects covered by Section 104(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (88 Stat. 640, 42 U.S.C. 5304(h)), the responsibilities under those provisions may be assumed by the appropriate applicant, if the applicant has also assumed, with respect to such projects, all of the responsibilities for environmental review, decisionmaking, and action pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

JIMMY CARTER

The White House,
May 24, 1977.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 1:44 p.m. May 24, 1977]

Floodplain Management

Statement by the President Accompanying Executive Order 11988. May 24, 1977

The floodplains which adjoin the Nation's inland and coastal waters have long been recognized as having special values to our citizens. They have provided us with wildlife habitat, agricultural and forest products, stable ecosystems, and park and recreation areas. However, unwise use and development of our riverine, coastal, and other floodplains not only destroy many of the special qualities of these areas but pose a severe threat to human life, health, and property.

Since the adoption of a national flood control policy in 1936, the Federal Government has invested about $10 billion in flood protection works. Despite substantial efforts by the Federal Government to reduce flood hazards and protect floodplains, annual losses from floods and adverse alteration of floodplains continue to increase.

The problem arises mainly from unwise land use practices. The Federal Government can be responsible for or can influence these practices in the construction of projects, in the management of its own properties, in the provision of financial or technical assistance including support of financial institutions, and in the uses for which its agencies issue licenses or permits. In addition to minimizing the danger to human and nonhuman communities living in floodplains, active floodplain management represents sound business practice by reducing the risk of flood damage to properties benefiting from Federal assistance.

Because unwise floodplain development can lead to the loss of human and other natural resources, it is simply a bad Federal investment and should be avoided. In order to avoid to the extent possible the long- and short-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains and to avoid direct or indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative, I have issued an Executive order on floodplain management.

Executive Order 11988. May 24, 1977

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States of America, and as President of the United States of America, in furtherance of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.*), and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (Public Law 93–234, 87 Stat. 975), in order to avoid to the extent possible the long and short term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains and to avoid direct or indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. Each agency shall provide leadership and shall take action to reduce the risk of flood loss, to minimize the impact of floods on human safety, health and welfare, and to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by floodplains in carrying out its responsibilities for (1) acquiring, managing, and disposing of Federal lands and facilities; (2) providing Federally undertaken, financed, or assisted construction and improvements; and (3) conducting Federal activities and programs affecting land use, including but not limited to water and related land resources planning, regulating, and licensing activities.

SEC. 2. In carrying out the activities described in Section 1 of this Order, each agency has a responsibility to evaluate the potential effects of any actions it may take in a floodplain; to ensure that its planning programs and budget requests reflect consideration of flood hazards and floodplain management; and to prescribe procedures to implement the policies and requirements of this Order, as follows:

(a)(1) Before taking an action, each agency shall determine whether the proposed action will occur in a floodplain—for major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, the evaluation required below will be included in any statement prepared under Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act. This determination shall be made according to a Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) floodplain map or a more detailed map of an area, if available. If such maps are not available, the agency shall make a determination of the location of the floodplain based on the best available information. The Water Resources Council shall issue guidance on this information not later than October 1, 1977.

(2) If an agency has determined to, or proposes to, conduct, support, or allow an action to be located in a floodplain, the agency shall consider alternatives to avoid adverse effects and incompatible development in the floodplains. If the head of the agency finds that the only practicable alternative consistent with the law and with the policy set forth in this Order requires siting in a floodplain, the agency shall, prior to taking action, (i) design or modify its action in order to minimize potential harm to or within the floodplain, consistent with regulations issued in accord with Section 2(d) of this Order, and (ii) prepare and circulate a notice containing an explanation of why the action is proposed to be located in the floodplain.

(3) For programs subject to the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95, the agency shall send the notice, not to exceed three pages in length including a location map, to the state and areawide A-95 clearinghouses for the geographic areas affected. The notice shall include: (i) the reasons why the action is proposed to be located in a floodplain; (ii) a statement indicating whether the action conforms to applicable state or local floodplain protection standards and (iii) a list of the alternatives considered. Agencies shall endeavor to allow a brief comment period prior to taking any action.

(4) Each agency shall also provide opportunity for early public review of any plans or proposals for actions in floodplains, in accordance with Section 2(b) of Executive Order No. 11514, as amended, including the development of procedures to accomplish this objective for Federal actions whose impact is not significant enough to require the preparation of an environmental impact statement under Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

(b) Any requests for new authorizations or appropriations transmitted to the Office of Management and Budget shall indicate, if an action to be proposed will be located in a floodplain, whether the proposed action is in accord with this Order.

(c) Each agency shall take floodplain management into account when formulating or evaluating any water and land use plans and shall require land and water resources use appropriate to the degree of hazard involved. Agencies shall include adequate provision for the evaluation and consideration of flood hazards in the regulations and operating procedures for the licenses, permits, loan or grants-in-aid programs that they administer. Agencies shall also encourage and provide appropriate guidance to applicants to evaluate the effects of their proposals in floodplains prior to submitting applications for Federal licenses, permits, loans or grants.

(d) As allowed by law, each agency shall issue or amend existing regulations and procedures within one year to comply with this Order. These procedures shall incorporate the Unified National Program for Floodplain Management of the Water Resources Council, and shall explain the means that the agency will employ to pursue the nonhazardous use of riverine, coastal and other floodplains in connection with the activities under its authority. To the extent possible, existing processes, such as those of the Council on Environmental Quality and the Water Resources Council, shall be utilized to fulfill the requirements of this Order. Agencies shall prepare their procedures in consultation with the Water Resources Council, the Federal Insurance Administration, and the Council on Environmental Quality, and shall update such procedures as necessary.

Sec. 3. In addition to the requirements of Section 2, agencies with responsibilities for Federal real property and facilities shall take the following measures:

(a) The regulations and procedures established under Section 2(d) of this Order shall, at a minimum, require the construction of Federal structures and facilities to be in accordance with the standards and criteria and to be consistent with the intent of those promulgated under the National Flood Insurance Program. They shall deviate only to the extent that the standards of the Flood Insurance Program are demonstrably inappropriate for a given type of structure or facility.

(b) If, after compliance with the requirements of this Order, new construction of structures or facilities are to be located in a floodplain, accepted floodproofing and other flood protection measures shall be applied to new construction or rehabilitation. To achieve flood protection, agencies shall, wherever practicable, elevate structures above the base flood level rather than filling in land.

(c) If property used by the general public has suffered flood damage or is located in an identified flood hazard area, the responsible agency shall provide on structures, and other places where appropriate, conspicuous delineation of past and probable flood height in order to enhance public awareness of and knowledge about flood hazards.

(d) When property in floodplains is proposed for lease, easement, right-of-way, or disposal to non-Federal public or private parties, the Federal agency shall (1) reference in the conveyance those uses that are restricted under identified Federal, State, or local floodplain regulations; and (2) attach other appropriate restrictions to the uses of properties by the grantee or purchaser and any successors, except where prohibited by law; or (3) withhold such properties from conveyance.

Sec. 4. In addition to any responsibilities under this Order and Sections 202 and 205 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4106 and 4128), agencies which guarantee, approve, regulate, or insure any financial transaction which is related to an area located in a floodplain shall, prior to completing action on such transaction, inform any private parties participating in the transaction of the hazards of locating structures in the floodplain.

Sec. 5. The head of each agency shall submit a report to the Council on Environmental Quality and to the Water Resources Council on June 30, 1978, regarding the status of their procedures and the impact of this Order on the agency's operations. Thereafter, the Water Resources Council shall periodically evaluate agency procedures and their effectiveness.

(a) The term "agency" shall have the same meaning as the term "Executive agency" in Section 105 of Title 5 of the United States Code and shall include the military departments; the directives contained in this Order, however, are meant to apply only to those agencies which perform the activities described in Section 1 which are located in or affecting floodplains.

(b) The term "base flood" shall mean that flood which has a one percent or greater chance of occurrence in any given year.

(c) The term "floodplain" shall mean the lowland and relatively flat areas adjoining inland and coastal waters including floodprone areas of offshore islands, including at a minimum, that area subject to a one percent or greater chance of flooding in any given year.

Sec. 7. Executive Order No. 11296 of August 10, 1966, is hereby revoked. All actions, procedures, and issuances taken under that Order and still in effect shall remain in effect until modified by appropriate authority under the terms of this Order.

Sec. 8. Nothing in this Order shall apply to assistance provided for emergency work essential to save lives and protect property and public health and safety, performed pursuant to Sections 305 and 306 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 (88 Stat. 148, 42 U.S.C. 5145 and 5146).

Sec. 9. To the extent the provisions of Section 2(a) of this Order are applicable to projects covered by Section 104(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (88 Stat. 640, 42 U.S.C. 5304(h)), the responsibilities under those provisions may be assumed by the appropriate applicant, if the applicant has also assumed, with respect to such projects, all of the responsibilities for environmental review, decisionmaking, and action pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

Jimmy Carter

The White House,
May 24, 1977.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 1:42 p.m., May 24, 1977]

Off-Road Vehicles on Public Lands

Executive Order 11989. May 24, 1977

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States of America, and as President of the United States of America, in order to clarify agency authority to define zones of use by off-road vehicles on public lands, in furtherance of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), Executive Order No. 11644 of February 8, 1972, is hereby amended as follows:

Section 1. Clause (B) of Section 2(3) of Executive Order No. 11644, setting forth an exclusion from the definition of off-road vehicles, is amended to read "(B) any fire, military, emergency or law enforcement vehicle when used for emergency purposes, and any combat or combat support vehicle when used for national defense purposes, and".

Sec. 2. Add the following new Section to Executive Order No. 11644:

"Sec. 9. *Special Protection of the Public Lands.* (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3 of this Order, the respective agency head shall, whenever he determines that the use of off-road vehicles will cause or is causing considerable adverse effects on the soil, vegetation, wildlife, wildlife habitat or cultural or historic resources of particular areas or trails of the public lands, immediately close such areas or trails to the type of off-road vehicle causing such effects, until such time as he determines that such adverse effects have been eliminated and that measures have been implemented to prevent future recurrence.

"(b) Each respective agency head is authorized to adopt the policy that portions of the public lands within his jurisdiction shall be closed to use by off-road vehicles except those areas or trails which are suitable and specifically designated as open to such use pursuant to Section 3 of this Order.".

Jimmy Carter

The White House,
May 24, 1977.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 1:43 p.m., May 24, 1977]

Exotic Organisms

Executive Order 11987. May 24, 1977

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States of America, and as President of the United States of America, in furtherance of the purposes and policies of the Lacey Act (18 U.S.C. 42) and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. As used in this Order:

(a) "United States" means all of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(b) "Introduction" means the release, escape, or establishment of an exotic species into a natural ecosystem.

(c) "Exotic species" means all species of plants and animals not naturally occurring, either presently or historically, in any ecosystem of the United States.

(d) "Native species" means all species of plants and animals naturally occurring, either presently or historically, in any ecosystem of the United States.

Sec. 2. (a) Executive agencies shall, to the extent permitted by law, restrict the introduction of exotic species into the natural ecosystems on lands and waters which they own, lease, or hold for purposes of administration; and, shall encourage the States, local governments, and private citizens to prevent the introduction of exotic species into natural ecosystems of the United States.

(b) Executive agencies, to the extent they have been authorized by statute to restrict the importation of exotic species, shall restrict the introduction of exotic species into any natural ecosystem of the United States.

(c) Executive agencies shall, to the extent permitted by law, restrict the use of Federal funds, programs, or authorities used to export native species for the purpose of introducing such species into ecosystems outside the United States where they do not naturally occur.

(d) This Order does not apply to the introduction of any exotic species, or the export of any native species, if the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior finds that such introduction or exportation will not have an adverse effect on natural ecosystems.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the heads of other appropriate agencies, shall develop and implement, by rule or regulation, a system to standardize and simplify the requirements, procedures and other activities appropriate for implementing the provisions of this Order. The Secretary of the Interior shall ensure that such rules or regulations are in accord with the performance by other agencies of those functions vested by law, including this Order, in such agencies.

Jimmy Carter

The White House,
May 24, 1977.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 1:41 p.m., May 24, 1977]

NEPA

Executive Order 11991. May 24, 1977

RELATING TO PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States of America, and as President of the United States of America, in furtherance of the purpose and policy of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857h–7), it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. Subsection (h) of Section 3 (relating to responsibilities of the Council on Environmental Quality) of Executive Order No. 11514, as amended, is revised to read as follows:

"(h) Issue regulations to Federal agencies for the implementation of the procedural provisions of the Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)). Such regulations shall be developed after consultation with affected agencies and after such public hearings as may be appropriate. They will be designed to make the environmental impact statement process more useful to decisionmakers and the public; and to reduce paperwork and the accumulation of extraneous background data, in order to emphasize the need to focus on real environmental issues and alternatives. They will require impact statements to be concise, clear, and to the point, and supported by evidence that agencies have made the necessary environmental analyses. The Council shall include in its regulations procedures (1) for the early preparation of environmental impact statements, and (2) for the referral to the Council of conflicts between agencies concerning the implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended, for the Council's recommendation as to their prompt resolution.".

SEC. 2. The following new subsection is added to Section 2 (relating to responsibilities of Federal agencies) of Executive Order No. 11514, as amended:

"(g) In carrying out their responsibilities under the Act and this Order, comply with the regulations issued by the Council except where such compliance would be inconsistent with statutory requirements.".

JIMMY CARTER

The White House,
May 24, 1977.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 1:45 p.m., May 24, 1977]

CEQ
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY • 722 JACKSON PLACE, N.W. • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

News Release

FOR RELEASE: On Receipt - June 2, 1977

CONTACT: Warren Eisenberg (202) 382-1235

SPETH CHARGES HOUSE-PASSED CLEAN AIR BILL WILL COST JOBS IN INDUSTRIAL AREAS

"The postponement of tougher exhaust controls on new cars sought by the auto industry will cost jobs in highly industrialized sections of the country. It will also increase greatly the burden of pollution control placed on the states." These statements were made today by Gus Speth, a member of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, in a speech before the Environmental Industry Council in Washington.

Speth strongly defended the Administration's Clean Air Act position. He charged "by caving in to Detroit's lobbying and slowing the Federal Government schedule for cleaning up auto fumes, the Clean Air Act amendment passed by the House of Representatives last week would put inordinate pressure on the states. The states would still be required to keep to existing schedules for air quality compliance. But to compensate for relaxed auto standards they would be forced to get tougher with stationary sources of pollution. It's buck passing by the Federal Government to the states."

"This means," said Speth, "reduced growth in the great industrial areas, and a job loss in up to thirty major metropolitan areas. Despite auto industry lobbying which claimed job losses on the auto assembly lines because of stricter standards, no consideration is given in the House-passed bill to economic losses resulting from slowing down auto emission controls.

Speth noted that officials in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut had expressed alarm at the possible effects to their states if a weak clean air bill becomes law.

Speth further observed that auto industry jobs would increase under the Administration's proposals, though at a slightly reduced rate. "We're talking about an increase in auto employment, not losses of existing jobs. Moreover, auto industry claims ignore the many pollution control jobs created in manufacturing and operating pollution control equipment."

"CEQ's analyses," said Speth, "indicate that pollution control requirements are currently creating more jobs than they are eliminating -- with a net gain of 300,000 to 400,000 jobs last year."

Turning a critical eye to other sections of the House-passed Clean Air legislation, Speth charged that "one amendment allowing increased construction of powerplants near national forests and parks would definitely cut visibility for natural wonders like the Grand Canyon. This smoke-screening of national parks will destroy breathtaking views which thrilled millions of Americans for generations. These vistas could become postcard memories."

Speth said demands for new energy sources to fill critical shortages make it imperative for reasonable clean air deadlines to be met.

"The Clean Air legislation before the Senate next week allows the car makers more than reasonable time to place new fuel efficient pollution control technology on their new lines. Additional delay on auto emission at a time when stepped-up coal production and conversion could add more pollutants to our air doesn't make sense."

High concentrations of nitrogen oxides reacting with hydrocarbons can result in serious respiratory ailments. Substantial exposure to carbon monoxide can affect the central nervous system, the heart and hearing. All three of these pollutants are in auto fumes.

"To protect health and ensure a full clean-up of air and a growing economy for today and into the 1990's, the Federal Government must keep industry close to the original target on emissions control," said Speth.

# # # #

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS AND NEPA

Delegation of National Environmental Policy Act Responsibilities to Community Development Block Grant Recipients

Council on Environmental Quality
Executive Office of the President
Washington, D.C.

May 1977

Foreword

In May of 1976 the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries (which has jurisdiction over the National Environmental Policy Act) asked the Council on Environmental Quality to analyze the delegation of environmental responsibilities under the Community Development Block Grant Program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In pursuing this review, CEQ met with officials from HUD, the Environmental Protection Agency, the General Accounting Office, the Department of Transportation, and the Department of Commerce. We also contacted the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the National Association of Counties, the American Institute of Planners, and other professional organizations, and we participated in several conferences and training workshops which greatly helped our review. Most important, CEQ visited officials in a dozen representative cities to hear their views on NEPA's effect on the decisionmaking process.

This report is intended to serve the needs of the Committee and to provide useful information to public and private organizations throughout the country. The Council welcomes ideas and suggestions on the block grant program and NEPA. Please address comments to CDBG and NEPA, Council on Environmental Quality, 722 Jackson Place N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

- A. Housing and Community Development Act 1
- B. NEPA Delegation 2

II. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 4

- A. General Observations 4
  - 1. Effect on Planning in Large Cities 4
  - 2. Smaller Cities 6
  - 3. Lower Income Groups 6
- B. Recommendations on HUD's Role 6
  - 1. Technical Assistance 7
    - a. Training 7
    - b. HUD Comments 8
  - 2. Written Guidance 9
    - a. Procedures 9
    - b. Substance 10
  - 3. Changes in the Regulations 10
    - a. Cumulative Assessments 11
    - b. Exemptions for Small Projects 12
    - c. Timing of Assessments 12
- C. List of Recommendations 15

Appendices

A. H/CD Act, Section 104(h) 16

B-1. Block Grant Programs, General Activities Funded in FY 1975 and FY 1976 17

B-2. CDBG Expenditures for Activities 18

C. Written Guidance on NEPA for the Block Grant Program 19

D. Conferences and Workshops 20

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.[1]

The new legislation marked a turning point in federal funding of urban development. For over two decades the federal government's primary involvement in cities was through HUD's approval and funding of programs such as urban renewal, Model Cities, water and sewer facilities, open space, and rehabilitation. But the narrow categories of grants were not always responsive to urban needs. More flexibility in federal funding was essential. Title I of the Housing and Community Development (H/CD) Act went into effect on January 1, 1975, and made two fundamental changes. First, it combined the old categorical grants into a single community development block grant (CDBG) to be allocated by formula.[2] Second, it shifted all responsibility for decisionmaking to the recipient communities.[3] Thus the H/CD Act created a new relationship between the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which would administer the CDBG program, and our nation's cities, which would take on new responsibilities with their new authority.

Almost every city in the country participates in the program. More than 4,500 communities receive block grants, including 513 central cities of 50,000 population or more, 76 urban counties of 200,000 or more, and about 4,000 smaller communities with populations less than 50,000.[4]

During the first program year, HUD approved $2.426 billion and in the second year approved $2.686 billion. Approximately 80 percent of the total funding is apportioned to metropolitan areas and 20 percent to nonmetropolitan areas.[5] Funding for future years is expected to increase.

---

[1] 42 U.S.C. § 5301 et seq. (Pub. L. 93-383, 88 Stat. 633) (1974).

[2] Id. § 106. In this report, section numbers refer to the sections of the public law, by which they are commonly known.

[3] Id. § 104.

[4] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Development Block Grant Program: Second Annual Report, Chapter 1 (preprint, December 1976).

[5] Ibid.

B. NEPA Delegation

Among the new responsibilities transferred to communities by the H/CD Act was compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.[6] NEPA responsibilities of the Secretary of HUD were delegated under Section 104(h) to the chief executive official of the recipient community. The rationale was simple: NEPA obligations were appropriately linked to the decisionmaking authority, which in the CDBG program was the recipient community.[7] Moreover, a major purpose of the H/CD Act was to remove HUD from detailed review and second-guessing of projects proposed by cities. The Congress therefore authorized a maximum of 75 days for HUD approval of entitlement applications, making it virtually impossible for HUD to carry out a substantive review of proposed projects.[8]

The combination of H/CD Act and NEPA requirements for the block grant program reinforced each law and furthered the congressional intent of each. For example, the H/CD Act states:

> The primary objective of this title is the development of viable urban communities, by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities, principally for persons of low and moderate income.[9]

---

[6] 42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq. (Pub. L. 91-190) (1970), as amended by Pub. L. 94-83 (1975).

[7] See National Environmental Policy Act Oversight: Hearings on Oversight of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 To Assess Certain Federal Agencies' Compliance Thereto and To Review Implementation Problems Before the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 94th Cong., 1st Sess. 210 (1975) (statement of Russell W. Peterson, Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality).

[8] 42 U.S.C. § 5304 (Pub. L. 93-383, §104(f), 88 Stat. 633) (1974).

[9] Id. § 101(c). See also § 104(a)(2)(C), which states that applicants must formulate a program which "takes into account appropriate environmental factors."

These goals are embraced by the declaration of policy in NEPA:

> The Congress, recognizing the profound impact of man's activity on the interrelations of all components of the natural environment, particularly the profound influences of population growth, high-density urbanization, industrial expansion, resource exploitation, and new and expanding technological advances and recognizing further the critical importance of restoring and maintaining environmental quality to the overall welfare and development of man, declares that it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments, and other concerned public and private organizations, to use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans.[10]

The purpose of Section 104(h) was to ensure that NEPA was fully applied to HUD's community development program even though HUD would no longer plan or approve community development projects. Several important safeguards were in the statutory requirements, including acceptance by the recipient community of federal court jurisdiction and consultation with CEQ by HUD in preparing the regulations. The delegation of responsibility took effect under regulations issued by HUD on January 7, 1975.[11]

---

[10] 42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq*. (Pub. L. 91-190) (1970), as amended by Pub. L. 94-83 (1975), § 101(a).

[11] 40 C.F.R. 1392 (1975); amended 40 C.F.R. 29992 (July 16, 1975) and 41 C.F.R. 26856 (June 30, 1976).

The House committee and most environmental groups are more accustomed to considering environmental impacts of proposals for dams, highways, powerplants, and other large single-purpose projects. The block grant program, on the other hand, is usually limited to projects of smaller scale. But even so, community development projects have important effects on local neighborhoods and the overall strength and vitality of our cities. One need only attend a citizen participation meeting or a city council hearing to witness the significance of the block grant program and its substantial impact on the human environment.

The environmental impacts associated with typical community development block grant projects are familiar to the urban dweller: noise from traffic or construction; threats to structures of historic or architectural value; pressure to expand infrastructure to serve housing or industrial developments at the city's fringe; controversial decisions on site selections of new neighborhood centers; rehabilitation of old housing stock that will upgrade a neighborhood but may also displace tenants who cannot afford higher rents. These and other impacts have been the focus of environmental reviews, including 80 environmental impact statements in the first 2 years of the program, prepared by cities in compliance with NEPA.

II. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The most important conclusion of our review is that cities receiving community development block grants can carry out NEPA responsibilities effectively and that the delegation of these responsibilities should continue. However, HUD should improve the present program with better technical assistance and written guidance, and with several minor changes in the regulations that govern the delegation.

A. General Observations

1. Effect on Planning in Large Cities

Larger cities have shown that they can carry out the environmental review process for their community development programs. Despite the first two years of difficult transition under the block grant program, cities now seem to be relatively comfortable with their new planning and review responsibilities. Perhaps one reason is that the

NEPA process was not altogether new. City officials were already familiar with NEPA because of federal projects for which environmental impact statements had been prepared.

The cities that CEQ examined have organized their NEPA responsibilities by authorizing a special environmental review staff to oversee their community development programs. Often an individual on the planning department staff was responsible for coordinating the block grant environmental review with other city departments and with the city's comprehensive planning efforts, such as the special studies funded by HUD's 701 planning assistance program[12] or by EPA's 208 water planning program.[13]

Another important effect of the change in review responsibilities was its influence on the overall city planning process in many of the cities visited. It appears that most cities are incorporating an environmental review process into the earliest stages of their overall planning. Cities are also taking a closer look at long-term and cumulative impacts of their projects. For example, the City of St. Paul has begun an environmental review of a proposed sewer extension funded under the block grant program, and the review includes secondary impacts intended to occur as a result of the sewer project, such as higher density housing.

Cities are also responding to greater demands under state, regional, and their own local requirements for environmental review. Over 30 states now have laws similar to NEPA, and most require some level of environmental review for community development projects.[14] Some of the more experienced states, such as California, Washington, and Minnesota, have been able to assist cities in their new community development environmental responsibilities. Procedural and substantive problems were far less frequent in such states.

---

[12] 42 U.S.C. § 5301 et seq. (Pub. L. 93-383, §§ 401-402, 83 Stat. 633, IV, Comprehensive planning) (1974).

[13] Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251 et seq. (Pub. L. 92-500, § 208, 86 Stat. 816) (1972).

[14] Council on Environmental Quality, Environmental Quality - 1976: The Seventh Annual Report of the Council on Environmental Quality (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976), 135.

2. Smaller Cities

The NEPA process is more difficult for smaller cities (under 50,000) because of staff constraints. Even here, however, we believe that the new responsibilities will encourage better planning for community development programs. For example, a city proposing community development projects may use some of its block grant funds for special planning studies and for increasing the city's capacity for environmental review.[15] Whatever the size of a city, the new NEPA responsibilities should make its officials more aware of the need to consider environmental impacts of its community development programs.

3. Lower Income Groups

An important measure of the success of the environmental review process is its record in highlighting the types of projects that would benefit low and moderate income citizens, as the H/CD Act requires.[16] For example, low and moderate income neighborhoods selected for substantial housing rehabilitation in San Francisco and Dallas were carefully reviewed in environmental impact statements.[17] Further, the potential public scrutiny in the environmental review process has discouraged some projects that probably would not have benefited low or moderate income citizens. Thus the environmental requirements appear to complement and reinforce the need to plan projects for lower income groups.

B. HUD's Role

The Council on Environmental Quality believes that HUD's current responsibilities are threefold: providing technical assistance to cities; making written guidance available; and modifying the regulations, based on HUD's ongoing evaluation for its annual report to the Congress.

---

[15] 40 C.F.R. § 58.9 (1975).

[16] 42 U.S.C. § 5301 *et seq*. (Pub. L. 93-383, § 104(b)(2), 88 Stat. 633) (1974).

[17] City of San Francisco, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Upper Ashbury Rehabilitation Assistance Program (Jan. 19, 1977); City of Dallas, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Code Enforcement and Demolition of Unsafe Structures (Jan. 26, 1977).

1. Technical Assistance

During the first two years of the program, cities experienced considerable difficulty obtaining technical assistance from HUD on specific projects. They needed advice on the preparation of good environmental assessments and on the detailed procedures of the new regulations. This lack of assistance from HUD stemmed from unclear instructions to HUD field staff on their new responsibilities as well as from the limited number of HUD personnel.

a. Training

Despite HUD's reluctance to provide detailed technical assistance, most HUD area offices have at least visited cities regularly to oversee their general performance.[18] Some HUD area offices have also conducted environmental review workshops for cities as part of HUD's overall training for the block grant program. HUD has provided speakers for workshops and conferences held by the Civil Service Commission, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs, the University of Texas at Arlington, and others (see Appendix D). An EPA official was usually a participant in order to explain EPA's role in reviewing environmental impact statements and in providing technical assistance regarding air, water, and noise pollution, solid waste disposal, toxic substances, and radiation. Regional meetings have served the important function of bringing together key officials from all levels of government to discuss problems and successes with the new environmental responsibilities.

One area in which HUD should help block grant recipients is water resources. HUD's Second Annual Report indicates that about 5 percent of HUD's annual block grant expenditures is being spent on water resource projects.[19] Most are relatively small, but some are large watershed projects, stream channelizations, and suburban sewer connections. The regulations require an environmental impact statement if a proposed water or sewer project would affect 100 acres or more of undeveloped land.[20] So far, about three dozen impact statements have been prepared on water resource projects, but most of them were deficient in project descriptions and consideration of alternatives. The most informative impact statements were the result of special EPA assistance. One of the best water resource impact statements was prepared by the City of Mesquite (just east of Dallas), where a nonstructural alternative of drainage ponds was selected after substantial public debate and thorough environmental analysis of several possible alternatives, including the original proposal of concrete diversions.[21]

---

[18] Community Development Block Grant Program: Hearings on Oversight on the Administration of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 Before the Senate Comm. on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. 501 (1976) (statement of David O. Meeker, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development).

[19] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Development Block Grant Program: Second Annual Report, Table 2.9 (preprint, December 1976).

b. HUD Comments

In addition to advice on environmental reviews and compliance with the regulations, HUD should now begin to comment routinely on draft and final environmental impact statements prepared by cities. Under existing regulations, HUD does not comment on (or even receive) impact statements prepared by its grantees.[22] HUD exempted itself from its usual commenting responsibility in order to emphasize the fact that it would not interfere with a city's decision-making, which is basic to the H/CD Act. But cities now understand that HUD does not have the authority to interfere, and the cities should benefit from HUD expertise.

City officials whom we visited explained that they would like to have HUD's comments for several reasons. First, the comments would stimulate a two-way dialogue between HUD and a city. Second, a city could respond more easily to comments from other federal agencies if it could turn to HUD for advice. Third, a city could apply HUD's experiences both in the area and in other parts of the country to similar proposals. Fourth, HUD may have its own related projects which would be affected by a city's community development program. In other words, HUD could function as a resource and clearinghouse for information.

---

[20] C.F.R. § 58.25 (1975).

[21] City of Mesquite, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Southwest Mesquite Drainage Project (Oct. 6, 1976).

[22] C.F.R. § 58.17(e) (1975).

For example, several cities, including Boston, Cleveland, and New York, are carrying out large demolition programs (on scattered sites throughout the cities) for which the environmental reviews have been completed. HUD could alert cities to similar activities elsewhere, including good sources for environmental assessments or impact statements.

Recommendation One

HUD should improve its assistance to cities by increasing its training efforts, especially for water resource proposals, and by commenting routinely on environmental impact statements prepared by cities.

2. Written Guidance

Cities need both procedural and substantive guidance in order to comply with HUD regulations and with NEPA. However, in 1975 HUD was reluctant to provide any guidance at all and did not release simple procedural recommendations such as forms and suggested recordkeeping until the end of the first year. The delay caused considerable confusion nationwide. HUD's Inspector General cited it as the prime cause of problems early in the program.[23]

a. Procedures

The current procedural guidance, Environmental Reviews at the Community Level, a Program Guide, is advisory and not required.[24] The Council concurs with HUD's advisory approach to the written guidance because of the diversity and the large number of cities, numbering over 4,500.[25] However, even though the guidance is only advisory, it is still important for cities to use it as best they can. HUD should make every effort to see that the written guidance is carefully evaluated and that it is kept up to date concerning assessment methods, new laws or regulations, and other relevant matters.

---

[23] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Inspector General, "Environmental Review Activities of Grantees Participating in the Community Development Block Grant Program," CO-99 (Dec. 29, 1976).

[24] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Environmental Reviews at the Community Level: A Program Guide, HUD No. 399-CPD (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975).

[25] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Development Block Grant Program: Second Annual Report (preprint, December 1976).

b. Substance

HUD's substantive guidance is the Guide for Environmental Assessment, which was prepared for HUD's own field offices and was released last year.[26] All block grant entitlement recipients have been given copies by HUD. It is an excellent catalog of detailed information. The Guide's individual looseleaf chapters can be revised easily; for example, the section on visual quality is now being improved. The Guide also suggests levels of importance for project impacts as well as levels of detail to be included in assessments.

Recommendation Two

HUD should continue to distribute copies of the procedural and substantive guidance, should evaluate their effectiveness, and should improve them accordingly.

3. Changes in the Regulations

CEQ is basically satisfied with current HUD requirements, but some sections should be improved. The three most important overall program changes are: (1) more emphasis on cumulative assessments, (2) exemption of extremely small projects from the environmental review requirements, and (3) more encouragement for early review of large proposals. In addition to these three changes and the recommendation for HUD to comment on environmental impact statements, minor improvements concerning public notices and time periods will resolve most of the procedural violations cited in the report from HUD's Inspector General.[27]

---

[26] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, Guide for Environmental Assessment (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), Subscription Stock No. 023-000-90151-0.

[27] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Inspector General, "Environmental Review Activities of Grantees Participating in the Community Development Block Grant Program," CO-99 (Dec. 29, 1976).

The Inspector General's report stated that in a number of cases HUD had not notified cities of regulations violations. Most cases were of a minor procedural nature and did not affect the environmental reviews. In a few cases HUD did not notify cities that their proposed projects were subject to the environmental impact statement requirement in Section 58.25 of the regulations even though HUD knew that the cities had not prepared impact statements. The Inspector General's report indicated that recently HUD has been advising cities of any violations and that in serious cases funds are being withheld until the cities have complied with the regulations.

The most effective way to review violations is for HUD to base its sanctions on the seriousness of the violations and to notify cities promptly of any problems. HUD has consulted CEQ on a proposed sanctions policy, and we expect HUD to implement an official sanctions policy soon.

a. Cumulative Assessments

Cities and federal agencies find it difficult to assess cumulative impacts of projects because of the many related impacts that will influence the final results. In fact, the problem may be compounded for cities by the tendency in the block grant program to plan relatively small projects (see Appendix B). Nevertheless, it is important for cities to take account of the overall effect of individual projects.

CEQ Guidelines address two areas of cumulative impacts:[28] geographical and functional relationships of projects. Such impacts could result from several relatively small projects in a single neighborhood. Or a series of citywide projects, such as selective demolition, might all serve the same function of eliminating safety or fire hazards. Such projects should be assessed together rather than on a project-by-project basis.

HUD's current regulations state that the "[e]nvironmental review should be conducted on as comprehensive a scale as is feasible and should be commenced as early as practicable."[29] However, city officials have expressed the need for HUD guidance on the application of this provision to various categories of community development projects. Land acquisition, for example, should include an assessment of the proposed future use. If future use is not known, then the assessment should indicate any limitations on future use (such as no heavy industry) and that an additional assessment will be carried out on the future use when it is proposed.

---

[28] Council on Environmental Quality, Guidelines for Preparation of Environmental Impact Statements § 1500.6(d), 38 Fed. Reg. 20550-20562 (1973).

[29] C.F.R. § 58.5(g) (1975).

Recommendation Three

HUD should expand its regulations on cumulative assessments to include geographical and functional criteria and should add examples of assessments on activities such as neighborhood improvements (with many small projects), demolition, and land acquisition.

b. Exemptions for Small Projects

Under current regulations, all projects[30] must be reviewed for their potential environmental impacts. However, review of some small community development projects with very little or no measurable environmental impact is not useful, although a brief description in the environmental review record would ensure that small projects are included in cumulative assessments.

There are several additional advantages to an exemption category for small projects. It would eliminate unnecessary paperwork and allow staff to concentrate on larger projects. Further, when the provision for cumulative impacts is amended, small projects would still be included in overall assessments.

Recommendation Four

HUD should amend the regulations to exempt small projects from the environmental review requirements, except for inclusion of brief project descriptions in the environmental review record.

c. Timing of Assessments

There are two categories of projects for which environmental review will be required following the change recommended above. Some projects are large enough to require assessments but are not large enough to require any particular timing in the city's approval process because they are part of the ongoing, routine city services, such as street improvements, code enforcement, and social programs. In some cases, limited alternatives may be relevant, such as the design, use, location, cost, or timing of the projects.[31] The important point is that the environmental review consider these alternatives sometime in the local approval process but that the timing may not be critical to project selection.

---

[30] Certain activities concerning planning, environmental studies, and administrative expenses are exempted in C.F.R. § 58.21 (1976).

In the second category are projects for which timing of the environmental (and economic or engineering) assessments is important. Ambitious proposals, such as new neighborhood centers, citywide housing rehabilitation, and large water resource projects, usually have several reasonable alternatives. Although each alternative could meet the planned goals, the alternatives may have quite different environmental impacts. Then the environmental review is most useful to the local decisionmakers if it is completed well before they begin to eliminate any reasonable alternatives and definitely before they select a specific alternative. In all cases, environmental reviews must be completed before a city requests HUD to release funds for the proposed project or group of projects.

All the city officials whom we interviewed were aware of this issue and shared our belief that early review of large proposals is essential. Cities may conduct environmental reviews before they submit applications to HUD, which would give city officials even more time to consider environmental issues in their community development programs. Each city that we visited had set up an early screening committee to consider proposals for eligibility, economic costs, and potential environmental impacts. The screening usually occurs during or shortly after the initial citizen participation meetings.

---

[31] 31 C.F.R. § 58.15 (1975).

It would be difficult and inappropriate for HUD to set out specific procedural requirements because cities have such different decisionmaking processes. For example, city council approval of a proposal may be final in one city but may require subsequent review in another. It should be possible, however, to advise cities of approaches that work well, including suggestions for early screening, brief assessments, and more detailed assessments.

Recommendation Five

HUD should add a section to the regulations requiring cities to weigh carefully the alternatives to proposals and, for large projects, to complete the environmental assessment while the local approval process can still consider reasonable alternatives.

Recommendations

Recommendation One

HUD should improve its assistance to cities by increasing its training efforts, especially for water resource proposals, and by commenting routinely on environmental impact statements prepared by cities.

Recommendation Two

HUD should continue to distribute copies of the procedural and substantive guidance, should evaluate their effectiveness, and should improve them accordingly.

Recommendation Three

HUD should expand its regulations on cumulative assessments to include geographical and functional criteria and should add examples of assessments on activities such as neighborhood improvements (with many small projects), demolition, and land acquisition.

Recommendation Four

HUD should amend the regulations to exempt small projects from the environmental review requirements, except for inclusion of brief project descriptions in the environmental review record.

Recommendation Five

HUD should add a section to the regulations requiring cities to weigh carefully the alternatives to proposals and, for large projects, to complete the environmental assessment while the local approval process can still consider reasonable alternatives.

APPENDIX A
H/CD Act, Section 104(h)

104(h)(1) In order to assure that the policies of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 are most effectively implemented in connection with the expenditures of funds under this title, and to assure to the public undiminished protection of the environment, the Secretary, in lieu of the environmental protection procedures otherwise applicable, may under regulations provide for the release of funds for particular projects to applicants who assume all of the responsibilities for environmental review, decisionmaking, and action pursuant to such Act that would apply to the Secretary were he to undertake such projects as Federal projects. The Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out this subsection only after consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality.

(2) The Secretary shall approve the release of funds for projects subject to the procedures authorized by this subsection only if, at least 15 days prior to such approval and prior to any commitment of funds to such projects other than for purposes authorized by section 105(a)(12) or for environmental studies, the applicant has submitted to the Secretary a request for such release accompanied by a certification which meets the requirements of paragraph (3). The Secretary's approval of any such certification shall be deemed to satisfy his responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act insofar as those responsibilities relate to the applications and releases of funds for projects to be carried out pursuant thereto which are covered by such certification.

(3) A certification under the procedures authorized by this subsection shall--

(A) be in a form acceptable to the Secretary,

(B) be executed by the chief executive officer or other officer of the applicant qualified under regulations of the Secretary.

(C) specify that the applicant has fully carried out its responsibilities as described under paragraph (1) of this subsection, and

(D) specify that the certifying officer (i) consents to assume the status of a responsible Federal official under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 insofar as the provisions of such Act apply pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, and (ii) is authorized and consents on behalf of the applicant and himself to accept the jurisdiction of the Federal courts for the purpose of enforcement of his responsibilities as such an official.

APPENDIX B-1

BLOCK GRANT PROGRAMS
GENERAL ACTIVITIES FUNDED IN FY 1975 AND FY 1976

	FY 1975	FY 1976
Redevelopment related	35.8	27.6
Code enforcement	2.2	1.5
Other public works	15.5	22.8
Water and sewer	6.1	3.6
Open space and neighborhood facility	5.7	8.0
Housing rehabilitation	14.5	19.8
Service-related facilities and equipment	7.4	5.8
Public services	12.8	10.8
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Development Block Grant Program: Second Annual Report, Table 2.9 (preprint, December 1976).

APPENDIX B-2
CDBG EXPENDITURES FOR ACTIVITIES

Activity	FY 1975	FY 1976
Acquisition for redevelopment/demolition	17.8	10.6
Relocation	8.1	6.1
Demolition	3.3	2.6
General urban renewal/NDP	5.8	7.3
Historic preservation	0.8	1.0
Code enforcement	2.2	1.5
Street improvements	10.7	12.2
Public works	3.5	8.0
Flood protection	0.8	2.4
Removal of architectural barriers	0.4	0.2
Water and sewer	6.1	3.6
Open space	3.5	5.2
Neighborhood facilities	2.2	2.9
Housing: new construction	0.0	0.7
Rehabilitation grants	5.1	5.1
Rehabilitation loans	7.2	10.6
Rehabilitation by community	2.0	3.4
Facilities/equipment: fire	0.9	1.0
Facilities/equipment: police	0.0	0.2
Facilities/equipment: recreation	3.9	2.2
Housing counseling: facilities/equipment	0.0	0.4
Interim assistance	0.3	0.1
Children's facilities/equipment	0.3	0.4
Transportation facilities/equipment	0.0	0.0
Elderly facilities/equipment	1.3	1.3
Youth facilities/equipment	0.1	0.2
Jobs facilities/equipment	0.1	0.2
Public services: general	3.5	2.5
Fire services	1.0	0.1
Police services	0.5	0.5
Recreation	0.3	0.4
Jobs	0.4	0.3
Economic development: services	1.0	0.5
Housing counseling services	1.0	0.6
Interim assistance: public health	0.8	1.2
Medical services	1.2	0.9
Child services	1.0	1.2
Transportation services	0.3	0.3
Elderly services	0.9	0.7
Youth services	0.3	0.6
Education	0.8	0.3
Legal services	0.7	0.6
	100.	100.

Note: Figures may not total because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Community Development Block Grant Program: Second Annual Report* (preprint, December 1976).

APPENDIX C
Written Guidance on NEPA for the Block Grant Program

From HUD

Environmental Reviews at the Community Level, A Program Guide, Office of Environmental Quality, Department of Housing and Urban Development, October 1975. HUD No. 399-CPD. 45 pages. Available free from HUD.

Guide for Environmental Assessment, Office of Policy Development and Research, Department of Housing and Urban Development, May 1976. GPO Subscription No. 023-000-90151-0. Available from GPO for $20, which includes all revisions for four years.

Other Sources

A Guide to Preparing Environmental Assessments for Community Development, National Model Cities Community Development Directors Association, February 1975. 51 pages. Available from the Association (1620 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 503, Washington, D.C. 20006) for $5.

Environmental Certification for Community Development: A Manual of Procedures, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, 1975. 86 pages. Available from NAHRO (2600 Virginia Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037) for $7.50.

Environmental Resource Data and Assessment Guide; Staff Report, Office of City Planning, City of St. Paul; January 1977. 159 pages. Available from the Office of City Planning (421 Wabasha Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55102) for $5. See also: "Environmental Assessments for Community Development Block Grants," Dzugan, Ken; Practicing Planner, Vol. 6, No. 2, April 1976.

APPENDIX D

The following are representative types of groups that have held conferences or workshops on community development block grants and NEPA. HUD has conducted training workshops on all aspects of the H/CD Act, including environmental responsibilities, in most parts of the country.

Sponsor	Location	Date
National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials	Washington, D.C.; Chicago; San Francisco	March and April 1975
Federal Regional Council, Environmental Task Force	Portland, Oregon	Nov. 12, 1975
National Association of Counties	Salt Lake City	June 29, 1976
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Community Affairs	Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Wilkes-Barre	October 1976
University of Texas at Arlington (School of Architecture and Environmental Design) and the North Central Texas Council of Governments	Dallas/Ft. Worth, Corpus Christi, Midland	January 1977
American Society of Planning Officials	San Diego	April 27, 1977

UPDATED AGENCY NEPA CONTACT LISTING

The following pages contain an updated listing of Agency Channels of Communication on NEPA matters. The Monitor staff would appreciate having any errors drawn to our attention.

The Editor

CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION WITH AGENCIES ON NEPA MATTERS 6/77

ACTION

(i) Head of Agency

Sam Brown
Director, Action
806 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20525
(202) 254-3120

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

(i) Head of Agency

Paul C. Warnke
Director, ACDA
320 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20451
(202) 632-9610

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Walter Baumann
Assistant General Counsel, ACDA
320 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20451
(202) 632-3530

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(i) Head of Agency

Bob Bergland, Secretary

(ii) Assistant Secretary with NEPA Responsibility

Dr. M. Rupert Cutler, Assistant Secretary for
for Conservation, Research and Education

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Errett Deck
Coordinator
Environmental Quality Activities
Office of the Secretary
Room 307A
Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20250
(202) 447-6827

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Raymond Fullerton
Office of the General Counsel
Department of Agriculture
Room 2409, south Building
Washington, D.C. 20250
(202) 447-4733

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (Continued)

AGRICULTURE MARKETING SERVICE

(i) Head of Agency

Dr. Ervin L. Peterson, Administrator

AGRICULTURE RESEARCH SERVICE

(i) Head of Agency

T.W. Edminister, Administrator

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

(i) Head of Agency

Kenneth E. Frick, Administrator

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Ray Hunter
Agricultural Stabilization and
Conservation Service
Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20250
(202) 447-6221

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

(i) Head of Agency

F.J. Mulhern, Administrator

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

(i) Head of Agency

Roy L. Lovvorn, Administrator

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

Denton E. Sprague, Acting Administrator

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Joseph Hanson
Deputy Administrator for Program Operations
FHWA, USDA
Washington, D.C. 20250
(202) 447-3394

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (Continued)

FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

(i) Head of Agency

Edwin L. Kirby, Administrator

FOREST SERVICE

(i) Head of Agency

John R. McGuire, Chief

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Roy Feuchter
Environmental Coordinator
Forest Service
Department of Agriculture
Room 3022, South Bldg.
(202) 447-4708

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

David A. Hamil, Administrator

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Blaine Stockton
Acting Chief, Management Analysis & Services Branch
Department of Agriculture
Room 4024, South Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20250
(202) 447-6148

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

(i) Head of Agency

Ronello M. Davis, Administrator

(ii) Assistant Administrator with NEPA Responsibility

Gerald Lowry, Acting Director
Environmental Services Division
Department of Agriculture
Room 6103
Washington, D.C. 20013
(202) 447-3839

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Donald W. Whitehead, Federal Co-Chairman

(ii) Alternate Federal Co-Chairman

George Seibels

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Francis Moravitz
Deputy Executive Director
Appalachian Regional Commission
1666 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20235
(202) 673-7874

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Harry Teter
Executive Director
Appalachian Regional Commission
1666 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.c. 20235
(202) 673-7874

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT/PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

(i) Head of Agency

Maj. Gen Harold R. Parfitt

(ii) Director with NEPA Responsibility

Paul J. Campanella
Environmental Coordinator

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Thomas M. Constant
Secretary, Panama Canal Company
Room 312
425 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20026
(202) 382-6453

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

(i) Head of Agency

Admiral Stansfield Turner, Director

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

James McDonald
Director of Logistics
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, D.c. 20505
(202) 281-8200

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

(i) Head of Agency

Lee R. West, Acting Chairman

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Ivars V. Mellups
Office of the General Counsel
Civil Aeronautics Board
Washington, D. C. 20428
(202) 673-5205

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Gary Edles
Office of the General Counsel
Civil Aeronautics Board
Washington, D.c. 20428
(202) 673-5205

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

(i) Head of Agency

Juanita M. Kreps, Secretary

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Dr. Sidney R. Galler
Assistant Secretary for Environmental Affairs
Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-4335

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

C. L. Haslam, General Counsel
Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-4772

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

Robert T. Hall, Assistant Secretary
for Economic Development

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liason

John Hansel
Special Assistant for the Environment
Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-4208

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Nick Farr
Chief Counsel
Department of Commerce
Room 7001A
Washington, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-4687

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

Robert J. Blackwell, Administrator

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

(i) Head of Agency

Dr. Richard Roberts, Director

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Dr. William Aron
Director, Office of Ecology and
Environment Conservation
NOAA - Room 5813
Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-5181

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

(i) Head of Agency

Honorable Harold Brown, Secretary

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

George Marienthal
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
(Environmental and Safety)
(M,Ra, & L)
3B252, Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301
(202) Ox5-0221

(i) Head of Agency

Roderick Hilees, Counsel

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Paul A. Belvin, Attorney
Securities and Exchange Commission
Office of Disclosure Policy
500 North Capitol Street, Room 629
Washington, D.C. 20549
(202) 755-1750

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

William L. Robertson
Office of the General Counsel
Department of Defense
Room 3D937, Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301
(202) 697-9135

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

(i) Head of Agency

John C. Stetson, Secretary

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Col. Luis F. Dominguez
Department of the Air Force
Room 5D431, Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20330
(202) 697-7799

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Grant Reynolds
Office of the General Counsel
Department of the Air Force
Room 4C927 (SAFGC) Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20330
(202) 697-7479

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

(i) Head of Agency

Honorable Clifford L. Alexander, Jr. Secretary

(ii) Assistant Secretary with NEPA Responsibility

Charles R. Ford
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Civil Works
Room 2E675, Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20310
(202) 697-7084

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Corps of Engineers -- Civil Works

LTC John R. Hill, Jr.
Assistant Director of Civil Works ,
Environmental Programs
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
DAEN-CWZ-P
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20314
(202) 693-7093

Military

George A. Cunney, Jr.
Acting Chief
Environmental Office
Office of the Assistant Chief of Engineers
Department of the Army
Room 1E676, Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20310

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (Continued)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (Continued)

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison (Continued)

Conservation Organization Liaison

Francis X. Kelley
Conservation Liaison Officer
Office of Public Affairs
Attn: DAEN-PAI
Office of the Chief of Engineers
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20314
(202) 693-6346

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Corps of Engineers

Betty J. Farwell
Assistant Chief Counsel for Litigation
Office of the Chief of Engineers
Department of the Army
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20314
(202) 693-7057

Army -- Military

Donald Hemke
Office of the General Counsel
Room 2E729, Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20310
(202) 695-3305

Army -- Judge Advocate General's Office

Col. Melnick, Designate
Chief, Office of the Judge Advocate General
Department of the Army
Washington, D.C. 20310
(202) 695-1721

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (Continued)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

(i) Head of Agency

Honorable J. Graham Clayton, Secretary

(ii) Assistant Secretary with NEPA Responsibility

Everett A. Pyatt, Principal Deputy Designate
Assistant Secretary, Installation and Logistics

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Edward W. Johnson
Head, Environmental Impact Statement/RDT&E Branch
Office of the Cheif of Naval Operations
Environmental Protection and Occupational Safety
and Health Division (OD/453)
Washington, D.C. 20350
(202) 697-3689

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Lt. Cmdr. Harvey Dalton, JAGC, USN
Head, Environmental Law Branch
Office of Judge Advocate General
Department of the Navy
Washington, D.C. 20350
(202) 695-0200

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

(i) Head of Agency

Lt. Gen. W.W. Vaughan

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Jan Reitman
Special Assistant for Environmental Quality
Cameron Station, 4D470
Alexandria, Va. 22314
(703) 274-6967

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Karl Dabeiseman
General Counsel
Defense Logistics Agency
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Va. 22314
(703) 274-6156

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Cecil D. Andrus, Federal Member

(ii) Federal Official with NEPA Responsibility

Thomas F. Sehweigert
U.S. Commissioner
Deleware River Basin Commission
Interior Building, Rm 6240
Washington, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-2347

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

William Thursby
Head Environmental Unit
Delaware River Basin Commission
P.O. Box 360
Trenton, New Jersey 08603
(609) 883-9500 (Ext. 268)

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

(vacant)

(ii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

W.H. Pennington
Office of NEPA Coordination
Energy Research and Development Administration
Mail Station E-201
Washington, D.C. 20545
(301) 353-4241

(iii) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Steven H. Greenleigh
Office of the General Counsel
Energy Research and Development Administration
Washington, D.C. 20545
(301) 353-3121

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

(i) Head of Agency

Douglas M. Costle, Administrator

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Rebecca W. Hanmer, Director
Office of Federal Activities
Environmental Protection Agency
537 West Tower
A-104
Washington, D.C. 20460

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

G. William Frick
General Counsel
Environmental Protection Agency
Room 513 West Tower
A-104
Washington, D.C. 20460
(202) 755-2511

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(i) Head of Agency

John L. Moore Jr.
President and Chairman
Export-Import Bank of the United States
811 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20571
(202) 382-1131

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Warren W. Glick
General Counsel
Export-Import Bank of the United States
(202) 382-1493

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Richard E. Wiley, Chairman

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Upton K. Guthery
Office of the General Counsel
Federal Communications Commission
(202) 632-6444

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

John F. O'Leary, Administrator

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Dr. Robert Stern
Director, Office of Environmental Programs
New Post Office Bldg., Room 7119
12th and Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20461
(202) 566-9760

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Theodore Wilson
Deputy Assistant General Counsel
for Conservation and Environment
Office of the General Counsel
12th and Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Room and 5116
Washington, D.C. 20461
(202) 566-9380

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Richard L. Dunham, Chairman

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Dr. Jack M. Heinemann
Advisor on Environmental Quality
Federal Power Commission
825 N. Capitol Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20426
(202) 275-4149

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Dexel D. Journey
General Counsel
Federal Power Commission
825 N. Capitol Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20426
(202) 275-4309

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Michael Pertschuk, Chairman

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison and
(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Jerold Cummins
Acting Assistant General Counsel for
Litigation and Environmental Protection
Federal Trade Commission
Washington, D.C. 20580
(202) 523-3613

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

Jay Solomon, Administrator of General Services

(ii) Assistant Administrator with NEPA Responsibility

Tom L. Peyton Jr.
Acting Commissioner
Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C. 20405
(202) 566-1100

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Andrew E. Kauders
Environmental Affairs Division
General Services Administration
18th and F Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20405
(202) 566-0405

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Herman W. Barch
Acting General Counsel
General Services Administration
18th and F Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20405
(202) 343-4221

GREAT LAKES BASIN COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Arthur Cratty, Acting Chairman

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Leonard T. Crook
Executive Director
Great Lakes Basin Commission
P.O. Box 999
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
FTS 374-5431

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION AND WELFARE

(i) Head of Agency

Joseph A. Califano, Jr, Secretary

(ii) Assistant Secretary with NEPA Responsibility

Dr. Robert Marik, Assistant Secretary
for Administration and Management

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Charles Custard
Director, Office of Environmental Affairs
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Room 524 FS HEW South
Washington, D.C. 20201
(202) 245-7243

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Bernard Feiner
Office of the General Counsel
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Room 5464 HEW North
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-7752

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(i) Head of Agency

Patricia Roberts Harris, Secretary

(ii) Assistant Secretary with NEPA Responsibility

Robert C. Embry, Jr., Assistant Secretary
for Community Planning and Development

(ii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Richard H. Broun
Director, Office of Environmental
Quality
Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D.C. 20410
(202) 755-6308

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Allan Polsby
Office of the General Counsel
Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D.C. 20410
(202) 755-6552

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

(i) Head of Agency

Cecil D. Andrus, Secretary

(ii) Assistant Secretary with NEPA Responsibility

Robert Mendelsohn (nominee), Assistant Secretary,
Policy, Budget, and Administration

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Bruce Blanchard
Director, Environmental Project Review
Department of the Interior
Room 4256 Interior Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-3891

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Gary Bohlke
Office of the Solicitor
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-6848

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (Continued)

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

Donald Paul Hodel, Administrator

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

(i) Head of Agency

(vacant)
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-7513

(ii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

William King
Chief, Division of Trust Facilitation
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Department of the Interior
1951 Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20245
(202) 343-4004

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

(i) Head of Agency

Curt Berklund, Director

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Robert Jones
Bureau of Land Management
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-5682

BUREAU OF MINES

(i) Head of Agency

(vacant)

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Andrew Corcoran
Special Assistant for Environmental Activities
Bureau of Mines
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-3941

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

(i) Head of Agency

Christopher Delaporte, Director

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Lewis Reid, Jr.
Chief, Office of Environmental Affairs
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-5711

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

(i) Head of Agency

R. Keith Higginson, Commissioner

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Al Jonez
Assistant to the Commissioner - Ecology
Bureau of Reclamation
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-4991

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (Continued)

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

(i) Head of Agency

Lynn A. Greenwalt, Director

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Steve Taub
Chief, Branch of Environmental Coordination
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240
(202) 376-8111

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

(i) Head of Agency

V.E. McKelvey, Director

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Herbert Steward
Special Assistant, Environmentalist
Office of Environmental Conservation
Geological Survey
Stop 108
Reston, Virginia
(703) 860-7493

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

(i) Head of Agency

Gary Everhardt, Director

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Gerald Patten
Chief, Park Planning and Environmental
Compliance Division
National Park Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-9377

U.S. SECTION
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION (US-Canada)

(i) Head of Agency

Richard L. Herman, U.S. Commissioner

(iii) Working Level NEPA Contact

Frances X. Popper
Engineer to the U.S. Section
Room 3810, GAO
441 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20548
(202) 783-9151

U.S. Section
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION (US Mexico)

(i) Head of Agency

J.F. Friedkins, U.S. Commissioner
P.O. Box 20003
El Paso, Texas 79978

(iii) Working Level NEPA Contact

T.R. Martin
Special Assistant - U.S. Section IBWC
Department of State - ARA/mex
Washington, D.C. 20520
(202) 632-9895

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Frank T. Fullerton
Special Legal Assistant IBWC
P.O. Box 20003
El Paso, Texas 79998

U.S. SECTION
INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION (US-CANADA)

(i) Head of Agency

Henry P. Smith, III, Chairman

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

James G. Chandler
Legal Advisor
U.S. Section
International Joint Commission
1717 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.c. 20036
(202) 632-9456

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

A. Daniel O'Neal

(iv) General Counsel

Mark Evans
General Counsel
Interstate Commerce Commission
Wafhington, D.C. 20423
(202) 343-4831

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Richard I. Chais
Chief, Section of Energy and Environment
Interstate Commerce Commission
Washington, D.c. 20423
(202) 275-7692

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

(i) Head of Agency

Griffin B. Bell, Attorney General

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Floyd France
Chief, General Litigation
Land and Natural Resources Divison
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 739-2736

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

(i) Head of Agency

R. Ray Marshall, Secretary

(ii) Assistant Secretary with NEPA Responsibility

(vacant), Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

David R. Bell, Chief
Office of Environmental and Economic Impact Assessment
Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Room N-3673
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210
(202) 523-7111

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Benjamin W. Mintz
Assistant Solicitor for Occuptional Safety and Health
Department of Labor
Washington, D.C. 20210
(202) 961-3965

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Douglas Chapman, Chairman

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison and
(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Robert Eisenbud
General Counsel
1625 I Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 653-6235

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

John W. Neuberger, Chairman

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Nicholas L. Barbarossa
Executive Secretary
Missouri River Basin Commission
10050 Regency Circle, Suite 403
Omaha, Nebraska 68114

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

Dr. James Fletcher, Administrator

(ii) Associate Deputy Administrator with NEPA Responsibility

Dunward L. Crow

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Nathaniel Cohen
Director, Office of Policy Analysis
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
400 Maryland Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20546
(202) 755-8433

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Gerald Mossinghoff
Assistant General Counsel
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Washington, D.C. 20546
(202) 755-3920

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Charles H. Conrad, Executive Director

(ii) Assistant Director with NEPA Responsibility

Donald F. Bozarth
Director of Current Planning and Programming
National Capital Planning Commission
Washington, D.C. 20576
(202) 382-1471

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Patricia Spillenkothen
Chief, Office of Environmental Affairs
National Capital Planning Commission
Washington, D.C. 20576
(202) 382-7200

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION (Cont.)

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Daniel Shear
General Counsel
National Capital Planning Commission
Washington, D.C. 20576
(202) 382-4584

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

(i) Head of Agency

Dr. Richard C. Atkinson, Director

(ii) Assistant Director with NEPA Responsibility

Dr. Edward P. Todd, Acting Assistant Director for
for Astronomical, Atmospheric, Earth and Ocean Sciences

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Dr. Edward P. Todd
Deputy Assistant Director for Astronomical,
Earth and Ocean Sciences
National Science Foundation
Washington, D.C. 20550
(202) 632-7300

John P. Giacomini
Special Assistant
Office of the Deputy Assistant Director for
Astronomical, Atmospheric,Earth and Ocean
Sciences
National Science Foundation
Washington, D.C. 20550
(202) 632-7360

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

General Counsel
National Science Foundation
Washington, D.c. 20550
(202) 632-4386

NEW ENGLAND RIVER BASINS COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Frank R. Gregg, Chairman

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Robert D. Brown
Staff Director
New England River Basin Commission
55 Court Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108
(617) 223-6244

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Marcus Rowden

(ii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Voss Moore
Assistant Director for Environmental Projects
Division of Reactor Licensing
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
(301) 443-6965

(iii) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Howard Shapor
Office of General Counsel
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
(301) 492-7308

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

(i) Head of Agency

Alvin J. Arnett, Director

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Arthur J. Reid
Deputy General Counsel
Office of Ecnonomic Opportunity
Washington, D.C. 20506

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

(i) Head of Agency

Thomas Bertram Lance, Director

(ii) Assistant Director with NEPA Responsibility

(none)

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison for A-95 Procedures

William K. Brussat
Intergovernmental Relations and Regional Operations
Office of Management and Budget
Room 9013 New Executive Office Bldg.
Washington, D.c. 20503
(202) 395-3030

Chuck Hughes
Intergovernmental Relations and Regional Operations
Office of Management and Budget
Room 8222 New Executive Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20503
(202) 395-4543

OHIO RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Fred E. Morr, Chairman

OHIO RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

C. A. Hays
Executive Director
Ohio River Basin Commission
Suite 208
36 East Fourth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 684-3831

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

(i) Head of Agency

Marshall T. Mays
President
Overseas Private Investment Corporation
1129 20th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20527

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Cecil Hunt
Deputy General Counsel
Overseas Private Investment Corporation
1129 20th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20527

PACIFIC NORTHWEST RIVER BASINS COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Donel J. Lane, Chairman

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Jack G. Johnson
Planning Director
Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission
P.O. Box 908, One Columbia River
Vancouver, Washington 98666
(206) 694-2581 FTS 422-9307

POSTAL SERVICE

(i) Head of Agency

Benjamin F. Bailer Postmaster General

(ii) Assistant Postmaster General with NEPA Responsiblity

William F. Bolger, Assistant Postmaster General
Real Estate and Building Department

POSTAL SERVICE (Cont.)

(iii) Working Level Liaison

Robert Coven
Director, Office of Program Planning
Real Estate and Building Department
U.S. Postal Service
Washington, D.C. 20260
(202) 245-4304

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

James J. Wilson
Associate General Counsel
U.S. Postal Service
Washington, D.C. 20260
(202) 245-4599

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Roderick Hilees, Counsel

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Paul A. Belvin, Attorney
Securities and Exchange Commission
Office of Disclosure Policy
500 North Capitol Street, Room 629
Washington, D.C. 20549
(202) 755-1750

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A. Vernon Weaver, Jr., Administrator

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Steven Klein
Attorney Adviser
Small Business Administration
Washington, D.C. 20416
(202) 382-6316

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

(i) Head of Agency

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Peter G. Powers
General Counsel
Smithsonian Instition
Room 408
Washington, D.C. 20560
(202) 381-5866

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

(i) Head of Agency

Cyrus Vance, Secretary

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Cameron Sanders
Director, Office of Environmental Affairs
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520
(202) 632-9169

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Jean Bailly
L/OES - Room 6420
Deparmtne of State
Washington, D.C. 20520
(202) 632-1989

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(i) Head of Agency

John J. Gilligan, Administrator

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Albert Printz
Environmental Coordinator
AID 320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20523

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

A.R. Richstein
General Counsel
AID/GC/TFHA, Rm 6951
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20523
(202) 632-1170

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

Cecil D. Andrus, Federal Member

(ii) Federal Official with NEPA Responsibility

Thomas C.H. Webster
U.S. Commissioner
Susquehanna River Basin Commission
Interior Building, Rm 6246
Washington, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-4091

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Robert J. Bielo
Robert J. Bielo
Executive Director
Susquehanna River Basin Commission
5012 Lenker Street
Mechanicsburg, Penn. 17055
(717) 737-0501

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

(i) Head of Agency

Aubrey J. Wagner, Chairman

(ii) Director with NEPA Responsibility

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Peter A. Krenkel
Director of Environmental Planning
Tennessee Valley Authority
720 Edney Bldg.
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401
FTS 854-3161

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Herbert S. Sanger
General Counsel
RVA
Knoxvill, Tennessese 37902
(615) 637-0101

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

(i) Head of Agency

Brock Adams, Secretary

(ii) Assistant Secretary with NEPA Responsibility

Judith Connor
Assistant Secretary for Environment, Safety,
and Consumer Affairs

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (Continued)

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Martin Convisser
Director, Office of Environmental Affairs
400 7th Street, S.W.
Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-4357

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Greg Wolfe
Office of the General Counsel
Department of Transportation
Room 10428
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-0140

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

Langhorne M. Bond, Administrator

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Charles Foster
Director, Office of Environmental Quality
Federal Aviation Administration
Room 940
Washington, D.C. 20591

Norman Arnold
Chief
Environmental Planning Branch
Room 616A
FAA
Washington, D.C. 20591

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Leonard Ceruzzi
Federal Aviation Administration
Washington, D.C. 20553
(202) 426-3924

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

William M. Cox, Administrator

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION (Cont.)

(ii) Associate Administrator with NEPA Responsibility

Joseph M. O'Connor, Associate Administrator for
Right-of-Way and Environment
Federal Highway Administration
Room 3213, Nassif Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-0100

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Michael Lash
Director, Office of Environmental Quality
Federal Highway Administration
Room 3226, Nassif BLDg.
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-0351

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Stan Abramson
Federal Highway Administration
Room 4213, Nassif Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-0791

U.S.COAST GUARD

(i) Head of Agency

Admiral Owen W. Siler, Commandant

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Don Dumlao
Environmental Impact Branch
Marine Environmental Protection Divison
U.S. Coast Guard
G-WEP-7/73
Washington, D.C. 20590

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Rue Helsel
Office of Chief Counsel
U.S. Coast Guard
Room 8434
400 Seventh St., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20950
(202) 426-1553

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

Richard Page, Designate, Administrator

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Peter Benjamin
Director of Program Analysis
Office of Transit Assistance
UMTA
(202) 472-2435

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

(vacant)
Assistant Chief Counsel for Opinions
UMTa
Room 9320
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-1906

DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY

(i) Head of Agency

W. Michael Blumenthal, Secretary

(ii) Assistant Secretary with NEPA Responsibility

Warren F. Brecht, Assistant Secretary for Administration

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

Anthony V. DiSilvestre
Assistant Director,Environmental Programs
Office of Management and Organization
Deparment of the Treausry
1435 G St., N.W., Room 701
Washington, D.C. 20220
(202) 376-0380

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Arnold Intrater
Office of the General Counsel
Department of Treasury
Room 1409
Washington, D.C. 20220
(202)

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

(i) Head of Agency

Donald C. Alexander, Commissioner

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

Robert Spatz
Office of the Chief Counsel
Internal Revenue Service
Room 3543
Washington, D.C. 20224

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

(i) Head of Agency

George W. Griebenow, Chairman

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

William C. Walton
Executive Director
Upper Mississippi River Basin Commission
Room 510 Federal Office Gldg.
Fort Snelling
Twin Cities, Minnesota 55111
(612) 725-4690

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

(i) Head of Agency

Max Cleland, Administrator

(ii) Deputy Administrator with NEPA Responsibility

Fred Rhodes

(iii) Working Level NEPA Liaison

For Housing Programs

Lyman T. Miller
Assistant Director for Construction and Valuation
Veterans Administration
810 Vermont Avenued
Washington, D.C. 20420
(202) 389-2691

George G. Wilkes, Jr.
Community Planner
VA
Washington, D.C. 20420
(202) 389-2997

WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

(i) Head of Agency

Cecil D. Andrus, Chairman

(ii) Director with NEPA Responsiblity

Gary D. Cobb, Acting Director
Water Resource Council
2120 L Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 254-6440

(iv) General Counsel NEPA Contact

James R. Readle
Water Resource Council
2120 L Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 254-6352

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
		DRAFT	Tanker Regs - Double Bottoms, Segregated Ballast	70587	05-13-77	USCG
		DRAFT	Atlantic Clam Fishery Management	70592	05-13-77	DOC
		DRAFT	Standards for Lime Manufacturing Plants	70654	05-26-77	EPA
		FINAL	Continental Divide and Kit Carson Trails	70567	05-09-77	DOI
		FINAL	Coal Conversion Program	70589	05-13-77	FEA
		FINAL	AID Pest Management Program	70593	05-13-77	STAT
		FINAL	Colorado River Water Quality Program	70614	05-20-77	DOI
		FINAL	Lead Content in Paint, Hazardous Product Ban	70679	05-31-77	CPSC
Alaska		DRAFT	Beluga Sta. # 7,8,9-Bernice Lake Unit 3	70582	05-12-77	USDA
		FINAL	Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, Alaska	70659	05-27-77	USN
		FINAL	Valdez-Midland, Crude Oil Transportation System	70669	05-31-77	DOI
		FINAL	Akhiok Airport, Alaska	70678	05-31-77	DOT
		SUPPLE	Alaskan N. Forests, Herbicide Use (S-2)	70581	05-12-77	USDA
Arizona		FINAL	Santa Cruz Riverpark, Tucson	70626	05-23-77	HUD
	Pinal	DRAFT	Vekol Hills Project, Papago Reservation	70609	05-19-77	DOI
Arkansas	Pulaski	DRAFT	I-630, I-430 -- I-30	70541	05-02-77	DOT
California		DRAFT	Hollywood-Burbank Airport	70572	05-09-77	DOT
		DRAFT	Vegetation Management w/ Herbicides, ORE/WAS/CAL	70603	05-19-77	USDA
	Fresno	FINAL	State Routes 41 and 180, Fresno, California	70639	05-24-77	DOT
		FINAL	Coalinga, Cal. - Sewer Line Extension	70647	05-25-77	HUD
	Los Angeles	DRAFT	San Gabriel Unit, Angeles N.F.	70590	05-13-77	USDA
	Monterey	FINAL	Ground Squirrel Control, Fort Ord Complex	70617	05-20-77	USA
	Orange	DRAFT	CSDOC Wastewater Management	70619	05-20-77	EPA
	San Bernardino	DRAFT	San Gabriel Unit, Angeles N.F.	70590	05-13-77	USDA
	San Diego	FINAL	De Luz Heights Municipal Water System	70595	05-16-77	DOI
	San Francisco	FINAL	North Point Park/Marina	70660	05-27-77	COE
	San Luis Obisp	FINAL	Ground Squirrel Control, Fort Ord Complex	70617	05-20-77	USA
	Solano	FINAL	Northeast Suisan, 983-acre Development	70601	05-18-77	HUD
	Sonoma	DRAFT	Santa Rosa, S. Park Neighborhood Development	70569	05-09-77	HUD
	Suisan	FINAL	Northeast Suisan, 983-acre Development	70601	05-18-77	HUD
	SAN DIEGO	DRAFT	San Diego Naval Sta., Berthing/Repair Pier #2	70576	05-11-77	USN
	Ventura	FINAL	Ready Missile Test Facility, Project P-875	70599	05-18-77	DOD
Colorado		DRAFT	Operation RMT, Chemical Materiel Transport	70611	05-19-77	USA

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
Colorado		DRAFT	Kensington Park Apartments	70668	05-31-77	HUD
	Adams	FINAL	S. Platte R. Flood Control, Chatfield Dam	70648	05-25-77	COE
	Arapahoe	FINAL	S. Platte R. Flood Control, Chatfield Dam	70648	05-25-77	COE
	Dolores	FINAL	Dolores Project, Colorado	70562	05-09-77	DOI
	Douglas	FINAL	S. Platte R. Flood Control, Chatfield Dam	70648	05-25-77	COE
	El Paso	DRAFT	Bellehaven/Vista Grande Terrace/Clear View Estates	70675	05-31-77	HUD
		FINAL	El Paso & Teller Co. Water Quality Management	70623	05-23-77	EPA
	Montezuma	FINAL	Dolores Project, Colorado	70562	05-09-77	DOI
	Teller	FINAL	El Paso & Teller Co. Water Quality Management	70623	05-23-77	EPA
Connecticut	Hartford	DRAFT	I-91 (Hartford-Enfield), I-29 (Windsor-Manchester)	70552	05-03-77	DOT
Delaware		DRAFT	Marshyhope Creek Watershed	70620	05-23-77	USDA
		SUPPLE	Inland Waterway, Del. R. - Chesapeake Bay (S-1)	70596	05-16-77	COE
	Sussex	FINAL	Indian River Power Station, Unit 4	70555	05-06-77	COE
Florida	Charlotte	FINAL	Punta Gorda Isles, Inc.-Section 15(Permit)	70588	05-13-77	COE
	Duval	FINAL	SE Extension of S.R. 9-A,I-95/295-Jacksonville	70652	05-26-77	DOT
	Hillsborough	SUPPLE	Tampa Harbor Deepening (S-2)	70642	05-24-77	COE
Georgia		DRAFT	Hartwell Lake, GEO/SC, O & M	70608	05-19-77	COE
		DRAFT	McManus Generating Station, Plants 1 & 2	70658	05-26-77	FEA
	Chatham	FINAL	Georgetown ASP 75-28	70565	05-09-77	HUD
Guam		FINAL	Guam International Airport	70625	05-23-77	DOT
Idaho		FINAL	Boise, Ida. - W. Boise Ave. Trunk Sewer	70671	05-31-77	HUD
	Boundary	FINAL	Boulder Planning Unit, Kaniksu N.F.	70542	05-02-77	USDA
	Idaho	DRAFT	U.S. 95, Ferdinand - Craigmont	70673	05-31-77	DOT
	Lewis	DRAFT	U.S. 95, Ferdinand - Craigmont	70673	05-31-77	DOT
Iowa	Polk	FINAL	Freeway 592, Polk and Warren Counties, Iowa	70640	05-24-77	DOT
	Warren	FINAL	Freeway 592, Polk and Warren Counties, Iowa	70640	05-24-77	DOT

FROM 05-01-77
TO 05-31-77

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

06-13-77

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
Kentucky		FINAL	Big South Fork National River	70631	05-24-77	COE
Louisiana		FINAL	Removal of Water Hyacinth, Aquatic Plant Control	70564	05-09-77	COE
	Iberville	SUPPLE	Bayou Choctaw Salt Dome - SPR (S-1)	70586	05-13-77	FEA
	Vermilion	FINAL	Vermilion Lock Replacement, Gulf ICW	70573	05-10-77	COE
Maine	several	DRAFT	So. Kennebec Valley Water Quality Plan	70618	05-20-77	EPA
	Cumberland	FINAL	Scarborough Wastewater Collection	70551	05-03-77	EPA
Maryland		DRAFT	Marshyhope Creek Watershed	70620	05-23-77	USDA
		FINAL	Monongahela River Basin Study	70559	05-09-77	ORBC
		SUPPLE	Inland Waterway, Del. R. - Chesapeake Bay (S-1)	70596	05-16-77	COE
	Baltimore	SUPPLE	Fort Holabird Disposal, Amended (S-3)	70594	05-13-77	GSA
	St. Mary's	FINAL	Md. Route 2 & 4, New Patuxent R. Bridge - S.R. 235	70629	05-24-77	DOT
Massachusetts		FINAL	Second Waterfront Urban Renewal, Gloucester	70624	05-23-77	HUD
Michigan	Chippewa	FINAL	DeTour Recreational Boat Harbor	70650	05-26-77	COE
Minnesota	several	DRAFT	Duluth Stormwater Flood Control (2)	70548	05-03-77	COE
	Dakota	DRAFT	Packer R. Terminal, Barge Terminal Expansion	70585	05-12-77	COE
	Hennepin	DRAFT	Maple Grove & Boundary Creek Additions	70543	05-02-77	HUD
	Lake	FINAL	Reserve Mining Co. Discharge Structure (Permit)	70556	05-06-77	COE
Mississippi	Bolivar	FINAL	Rosedale Harbor Navigation Improvements, Miss.	70634	05-24-77	COE
	Coahoma	FINAL	Rosedale Harbor Navigation Improvements, Miss.	70634	05-24-77	COE
	Sunflower	FINAL	Rosedale Harbor Navigation Improvements, Miss.	70634	05-24-77	COE
	Tishomingo	DRAFT	Yellow Creek Nuclear Plant	70670	05-31-77	TVA
Missouri	Camden	FINAL	Lake of the Ozarks Crossing by 161 kV Line, Permit	70662	05-27-77	COE
	Jackson	DRAFT	Lee's Summit Rd. Improve, US 24 -- I-70	70560	05-09-77	DOT
		FINAL	South Midtown Freeway (Route 71)	70616	05-20-77	DOT

FROM 05-01-77
TO 05-31-77

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

06-13-77

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
Montana	several	FINAL	Ninemile-Mill Unit Plan, Lolo N.F.	70566	05-09-77	USDA
	Clark	FINAL	Ophir-Dog-Macdonald Pass, Helena N.F.	70607	05-19-77	USDA
	Gallatin	FINAL	Mount Hebgen Management Alternatives	70600	05-18-77	USDA
	Lewis	FINAL	Ophir-Dog-Macdonald Pass, Helena N.F.	70607	05-19-77	USDA
	Lewis and Clar	FINAL	Helena, Mon. - Eastside #2 Sanitary Sewer	70545	05-02-77	HUD
	Powell	FINAL	Ophir-Dog-Macdonald Pass, Helena N.F.	70607	05-19-77	USDA
	Ravalli	DRAFT	Big Creek Dam, Selway Bitteroot Area	70613	05-20-77	USDA
Nebraska	Butler	FINAL	US 81 and US 30, Columbus, Nebraska	70580	05-12-77	DOT
	Harlan	DRAFT	Harlan County Lake O & M	70633	05-24-77	COE
	Platte	FINAL	US 81 and US 30, Columbus, Nebraska	70580	05-12-77	DOT
	Polk	FINAL	US 81 and US 30, Columbus, Nebraska	70580	05-12-77	DOT
Nevada		DRAFT	Lower Truckee-Lower Carson R. Basins	70610	05-19-77	DOI
		FINAL	Colorado River Water Quality Program	70614	05-20-77	DOI
New Jersey	Ocean	FINAL	Pebble Beach-Indianola Development Permit	70612	05-20-77	COE
New Mexico	Lincoln	DRAFT	Eagle Creek Dam & Reservoir	70549	05-03-77	USDA
	Otero	DRAFT	Eagle Creek Dam & Reservoir	70549	05-03-77	USDA
	Rio Arriba	FINAL	W. Spruce Budworm Suppression & Evaluation	70602	05-18-77	USDA
		FINAL	Abiquiu Dam and Reservoir, O&M	70655	05-26-77	COE
	San Juan	FINAL	Navajo Reservation, Coal Lease & Mining Plan	70575	05-11-77	DOI
	Sandoval	FINAL	W. Spruce Budworm Suppression & Evaluation	70602	05-18-77	USDA
		SUPPLE	S.R. 44, San Ysidro-north (S-2)	70632	05-24-77	DOT
New York	Erie	DRAFT	Buffalo Light Rail Rapid Transit	70657	05-26-77	DOT
	Monroe	FINAL	I-590, Rochester Outer Loop	70622	05-23-77	DOT
		FINAL	Rochester General Mail Facility	70637	05-24-77	USPS
	Niagara	DRAFT	Buffalo Light Rail Rapid Transit	70657	05-26-77	DOT
North Carolina	Hyde	FINAL	Wilkerson Creek Bridge, Replacement	70554	05-05-77	COE
North Dakota	Benson	FINAL	U.S. 2, Leeds to Churches Ferry	70636	05-24-77	DOT

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
North Dakota	Cavalier	DRAFT	Pembilier Lake & Dam (2)	70570	05-09-77	COE
	Pembina	DRAFT	Pembilier Lake & Dam (2)	70570	05-09-77	COE
Ohio		DRAFT	Ohio R. Bridge & US 22, WVa.-Ohio	70615	05-20-77	USCG
	several	DRAFT	ADHS Corridor D, Williamsburg - Pebbles	70644	05-24-77	DOT
	Cuyahoga	DRAFT	Big Creek Flood Protection Project	70677	05-31-77	COE
	Ottawa	DRAFT	Port Clinton Harbor, Maintenance Operations	70578	05-12-77	COE
	Pike	FINAL	Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant Site	70621	05-23-77	ERDA
Oklahoma		FINAL	Red River Chloride Control	70604	05-18-77	COE
		FINAL	Lawton, Oklahoma - Industrial Waterline	70667	05-31-77	HUD
	Tulsa	FINAL	Tulsa Urban Renewal River Parks Proj., Permit	70661	05-27-77	COE
Oregon		DRAFT	Vegetation Management w/ Herbicides, ORE/WAS/CAL	70603	05-19-77	USDA
		FINAL	Oregon Butte Unit Plan, Umatilla N.F.	70550	05-03-77	USDA
	Curry	DRAFT	Illinois Wild & Scenic River Proposal	70643	05-24-77	USDA
	Hood River	DRAFT	Mt. Hood Meadows Ski Area	70680	05-31-77	USDA
	Josephine	DRAFT	Illinois Wild & Scenic River Proposal	70643	05-24-77	USDA
Pennsylvania		FINAL	Monongahela River Basin Study	70559	05-09-77	ORBC
	Allegheny	DRAFT	Allegheny Valley Expressway (L.R. 1037, 5D & 5E)	70635	05-24-77	DOT
	Bedford	DRAFT	Everett Bypass	70649	05-26-77	DOT
South Carolina		DRAFT	Hartwell Lake, GEO/SC, O & M	70608	05-19-77	COE
	Berkeley	FINAL	E. Cooper & Berkeley RR Co., Berkeley County Line	70553	05-04-77	ICC
Tennessee		FINAL	Memphis, Tenn. - New Chicago Area	70584	05-12-77	HUD
		FINAL	Big South Fork National River	70631	05-24-77	COE
	Knoxville	DRAFT	I-640, S.R. 33 - I-40	70672	05-31-77	DOT
	Overton	DRAFT	S.R. 42, Algood Bypass - Livingston Bypass	70577	05-12-77	DOT
	Putnam	DRAFT	S.R. 42, Algood Bypass - Livingston Bypass	70577	05-12-77	DOT
Texas		DRAFT	Summerfields Community	70653	05-26-77	HUD
		FINAL	Red River Chloride Control	70604	05-18-77	COE

FROM 05-01-77
TO 05-31-77

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

06-13-77

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
Texas		FINAL	Valdez-Midland, Crude Oil Transportation System	70669	05-31-77	DOI
	Fort Bend	DRAFT	Mission Bend Subdivision	70557	05-06-77	HUD
		DRAFT	Willowridge Subdivision	70627	05-24-77	HUD
	Harris	DRAFT	Sommerall Subdivision, Texas	70546	05-02-77	HUD
		DRAFT	Mission Bend Subdivision	70557	05-06-77	HUD
		DRAFT	Parkway Forest Subdivision	70574	05-11-77	HUD
		DRAFT	Sherwood Trails Subdivision	70605	05-19-77	HUD
		DRAFT	Willowridge Subdivision	70627	05-24-77	HUD
		DRAFT	Sterling Green Subdivision	70628	05-24-77	HUD
		DRAFT	Inwood North Subdivision	70630	05-24-77	HUD
		DRAFT	Wingate Subdivision	70646	05-24-77	HUD
		DRAFT	Rolling Green Subdivision	70665	05-31-77	HUD
		DRAFT	Vince and Little Vince Bayous	70676	05-31-77	COE
	Midland	FINAL	Midland North Arterial Loop	70638	05-24-77	DOT
	Tarrant	DRAFT	CandleRidge - So. Ridge Communities	70583	05-12-77	HUD
U.S. Territory		DRAFT	Babelthuap-Koror Airport	70681	05-31-77	DOT
Utah		DRAFT	Operation RMT, Chemical Materiel Transport	70611	05-19-77	USA
		FINAL	Colorado River Water Quality Program	70614	05-20-77	DOI
	Utah	FINAL	Mapleton Center Street, Utah	70558	05-09-77	DOT
Vermont	Windham	FINAL	Deerfield R. Area Plan, Green Mt. N.F.	70641	05-24-77	USDA
Virginia		DRAFT	V.A. Replacement Hospital, Richmond	70606	05-19-77	VA
	Henrico	DRAFT	Henrico Co. Wastewater Facilities	70651	05-26-77	EPA
	Rockbridge	SUPPLE	Buena Vista Flood Protection (S-1)	70563	05-09-77	COE
	York	DRAFT	York River Wastewater Facility	70664	05-31-77	EPA
Washington		DRAFT	Vegetation Management w/ Herbicides, ORE/WAS/CAL	70603	05-19-77	USDA
		FINAL	Oregon Butte Unit Plan, Umatilla N.F.	70550	05-03-77	USDA
	several	SUPPLE	1976 Coop. W. Spruce Budworm Plan (S-1)	70568	05-09-77	USDA
	Benton	FINAL	SR 14, Kennewick Vicinity	70674	05-31-77	DOT
	Clark	DRAFT	FY 1978 Bonneville Dam Integrations Transmission	70579	05-12-77	DOT
	King	DRAFT	Renton, Cedar River Trail System	70571	05-09-77	HUD
	Skamania	DRAFT	FY 1978 Bonneville Dam Integrations Transmission	70579	05-12-77	DOT
	Snohomish	DRAFT	S.R. 2, Fobes Hill - N. Monroe Interchange	70645	05-24-77	DOT

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
West Virginia		DRAFT	Ohio R. Bridge & US 22, WVa.-Ohio	70615	05-20-77	USCG
		FINAL	Monongahela River Basin Study	70559	05-09-77	ORBC
	Mason	FINAL	Appalachian Power Co. Power Plant, New Haven	70591	05-13-77	COE
Wisconsin	Dane	SUPPLEUS	18-151 Corridor,Dodgeville-Mt. Horeb (S-1)	70539	05-02-77	DOT
	Iowa	SUPPLEUS	18-151 Corridor,Dodgeville-Mt. Horeb (S-1)	70539	05-02-77	DOT
	Outagamie	FINAL	Oneida St. Bridge and Approaches, Appleton	70561	05-09-77	DOT
	Racine	DRAFT	Racine Harbor, Interim II	70656	05-26-77	COE
	Wood	FINAL	Daly Avenue Route, Wisconsin Rapids	70544	05-02-77	DOT
Wyoming	Teton	DRAFT	Jackson Wastewater Treatment System	70598	05-17-77	EPA

AGENCY BUREAU	STATUS	STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	NTIS ORDER NUMBER
CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION					
	FINAL	Lead Content in Paint, Hazardous Product Ban	70679	05-31-77	(none)
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
	DRAFT	Eagle Creek Dam & Reservoir	70549	05-03-77	(none)
		San Gabriel Unit, Angeles N.F.	70590	05-13-77	(none)
		Vegetation Management w/ Herbicides, ORE/WAS/CAL	70603	05-19-77	(none)
		Big Creek Dam, Selway Bitteroot Area	70613	05-20-77	(none)
		Illinois Wild & Scenic River Proposal	70643	05-24-77	(none)
		Mt. Hood Meadows Ski Area	70680	05-31-77	(none)
	FINAL	Boulder Planning Unit, Kaniksu N.F.	70542	05-02-77	(none)
		Oregon Butte Unit Plan, Umatilla N.F.	70550	05-03-77	(none)
		Ninemile-Mill Unit Plan, Lolo N.F.	70566	05-09-77	(none)
		Mount Hebgen Management Alternatives	70600	05-18-77	(none)
		W. Spruce Budworm Suppression & Evaluation	70602	05-18-77	(none)
		Ophir-Dog-Macdonald Pass, Helena N.F.	70607	05-19-77	(none)
		Deerfield R. Area Plan, Green Mt. N.F.	70641	05-24-77	(none)
	SUPPLEM	1976 Coop. W. Spruce Budworm Plan (S-1)	70568	05-09-77	(none)
		Alaskan N. Forests, Herbicide Use (S-2)	70581	05-12-77	(none)
Rural Electrification Administration					
	DRAFT	Beluga Sta. # 7,8,9-Bernice Lake Unit 3	70582	05-12-77	(none)
Soil Conservation Service					
	DRAFT	Marshyhope Creek Watershed	70620	05-23-77	(none)
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
Nat'l Oceanic and Atmospheric Admin.					
	DRAFT	Atlantic Clam Fishery Management	70592	05-13-77	(none)
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Navy					
	FINAL	Ready Missile Test Facility, Project P-875	70599	05-18-77	(none)
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Army					
	DRAFT	Operation RMT, Chemical Materiel Transport	70611	05-19-77	(none)
	FINAL	Ground Squirrel Control, Fort Ord Complex	70617	05-20-77	(none)

FROM 05-01-77
TO 05-31-77

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

06-13-77

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

AGENCY BUREAU	STATUS	STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	NTIS ORDER NUMBER
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Army Corps					
	DRAFT	Duluth Stormwater Flood Control (2)	70548	05-03-77	(none)
		Pembilier Lake & Dam (2)	70570	05-09-77	(none)
		Port Clinton Harbor, Maintenance Operations	70578	05-12-77	(none)
		Packer R. Terminal, Barge Terminal Expansion	70585	05-12-77	(none)
		Hartwell Lake, GEO/SC, O & M	70608	05-19-77	(none)
		Harlan County Lake O & M	70633	05-24-77	(none)
		Racine Harbor, Interim II	70656	05-26-77	(none)
		Vince and Little Vince Bayous	70676	05-31-77	(none)
		Big Creek Flood Protection Project	70677	05-31-77	(none)
	FINAL	Wilkerson Creek Bridge, Replacement	70554	05-05-77	(none)
		Indian River Power Station, Unit 4	70555	05-06-77	(none)
		Reserve Mining Co. Discharge Structure (Permit)	70556	05-06-77	(none)
		Removal of Water Hyacinth, Aquatic Plant Control	70564	05-09-77	(none)
		Vermilion Lock Replacement, Gulf ICW	70573	05-10-77	(none)
		Punta Gorda Isles, Inc.-Section 15(Permit)	70588	05-13-77	(none)
		Appalachian Power Co. Power Plant, New Haven	70591	05-13-77	(none)
		Red River Chloride Control	70604	05-18-77	(none)
		Pebble Beach-Indianola Development Permit	70612	05-20-77	(none)
		Big South Fork National River	70631	05-24-77	(none)
		Rosedale Harbor Navigation Improvements, Miss.	70634	05-24-77	(none)
		S. Platte R. Flood Control, Chatfield Dam	70648	05-25-77	(none)
		DeTour Recreational Boat Harbor	70650	05-26-77	(none)
		Abiquiu Dam and Reservoir, O&M	70655	05-26-77	(none)
		North Point Park/Marina	70660	05-27-77	(none)
		Tulsa Urban Renewal River Parks Proj., Permit	70661	05-27-77	(none)
		Lake of the Ozarks Crossing by 161 kV Line, Permit	70662	05-27-77	(none)
	SUPPLEM	Buena Vista Flood Protection (S-1)	70563	05-09-77	(none)
		Inland Waterway, Del. R. - Chesapeake Bay (S-1)	70596	05-16-77	(none)
		Tampa Harbor Deepening (S-2)	70642	05-24-77	(none)
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Navy					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Navy	DRAFT	San Diego Naval Sta., Berthing/Repair Pier #2	70576	05-11-77	(none)
	FINAL	Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, Alaska	70659	05-27-77	(none)
DEPARTMENT OF HUD					
	DRAFT	Maple Grove & Boundary Creek Additions	70543	05-02-77	(none)
		Sommerall Subdivision, Texas	70546	05-02-77	(none)
		Mission Bend Subdivision	70557	05-06-77	(none)
		Parkway Forest Subdivision	70574	05-11-77	(none)
		CandleRidge - So. Ridge Communities	70583	05-12-77	(none)

AGENCY BUREAU	STATUS	STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	NTIS ORDER NUMBER
DEPARTMENT OF HUD					
	DRAFT	Sherwood Trails Subdivision	70605	05-19-77	(none)
		Willowridge Subdivision	70627	05-24-77	(none)
		Sterling Green Subdivision	70628	05-24-77	(none)
		Inwood North Subdivision	70630	05-24-77	(none)
		Wingate Subdivision	70646	05-24-77	(none)
		Summerfields Community	70653	05-26-77	(none)
		Rolling Green Subdivision	70665	05-31-77	(none)
		Kensington Park Apartments	70668	05-31-77	(none)
		Bellehaven/Vista Grande Terrace/Clear View Estates	70675	05-31-77	(none)
	FINAL	Georgetown ASP 75-28	70565	05-09-77	(none)
		Northeast Suisan, 983-acre Development	70601	05-18-77	(none)
		Second Waterfront Urban Renewal, Gloucester	70624	05-23-77	(none)
Section 104(h)	DRAFT	Santa Rosa, S. Park Neighborhood Development	70569	05-09-77	(none)
		Renton, Cedar River Trail System	70571	05-09-77	(none)
	FINAL	Helena, Mon. - Eastside #2 Sanitary Sewer	70545	05-02-77	(none)
		Memphis, Tenn. - New Chicago Area	70584	05-12-77	(none)
		Santa Cruz Riverpark, Tucson	70626	05-23-77	(none)
		Coalinga, Cal. - Sewer Line Extension	70647	05-25-77	(none)
		Lawton, Oklahoma - Industrial Waterline	70667	05-31-77	(none)
		Boise, Ida. - W. Boise Ave. Trunk Sewer	70671	05-31-77	(none)
DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR Bureau of Indian Affairs					
	DRAFT	Vekol Hills Project, Papago Reservation	70609	05-19-77	(none)
		Lower Truckee-Lower Carson R. Basins	70610	05-19-77	(none)
Bureau of Land Management					
	FINAL	Navajo Reservation, Coal Lease & Mining Plan	70575	05-11-77	(none)
		Valdez-Midland, Crude Oil Transportation System	70669	05-31-77	(none)
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation					
	FINAL	Continental Divide and Kit Carson Trails	70567	05-09-77	(none)
Bureau of Reclamation					
	FINAL	Dolores Project, Colorado	70562	05-09-77	(none)
		De Luz Heights Municipal Water System	70595	05-16-77	(none)
		Colorado River Water Quality Program	70614	05-20-77	(none)
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Bonneville Power Administration					
	DRAFT	FY 1978 Bonneville Dam Integrations Transmission	70579	05-12-77	(none)
Federal Aviation Administration					
	DRAFT	Hollywood-Burbank Airport	70572	05-09-77	(none)

AGENCY BUREAU	STATUS	STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	NTIS ORDER NUMBER
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Federal Aviation Administration					
	DRAFT	Babelthuap-Koror Airport	70681	05-31-77	(none)
	FINAL	Guam International Airport	70625	05-23-77	(none)
		Akhiok Airport, Alaska	70678	05-31-77	(none)
Federal Highway Administration					
	DRAFT	I-630, I-430 -- I-30	70541	05-02-77	(none)
		I-91 (Hartford-Enfield), I-29 (Windsor-Manchester)	70552	05-03-77	(none)
		Lee's Summit Rd. Improve, US 24 — I-70	70560	05-09-77	(none)
		S.R. 42, Algood Bypass - Livingston Bypass	70577	05-12-77	(none)
		Allegheny Valley Expressway (L.R. 1037, 5D & 5E)	70635	05-24-77	(none)
		ADHS Corridor D, Williamsburg - Pebbles	70644	05-24-77	(none)
		S.R. 2, Fobes Hill - N. Monroe Interchange	70645	05-24-77	(none)
		Everett Bypass	70649	05-26-77	(none)
		I-640, S.R. 33 - I-40	70672	05-31-77	(none)
		U.S. 95, Ferdinand - Craigmont	70673	05-31-77	(none)
	FINAL	Daly Avenue Route, Wisconsin Rapids	70544	05-02-77	(none)
		Mapleton Center Street, Utah	70558	05-09-77	(none)
		Oneida St. Bridge and Approaches, Appleton	70561	05-09-77	(none)
		US 81 and US 30, Columbus, Nebraska	70580	05-12-77	(none)
		South Midtown Freeway (Route 71)	70616	05-20-77	(none)
		I-590, Rochester Outer Loop	70622	05-23-77	(none)
		Md. Route 2 & 4, New Patuxent R. Bridge - S.R. 235	70629	05-24-77	(none)
		U.S. 2, Leeds to Churches Ferry	70636	05-24-77	(none)
		Midland North Arterial Loop	70638	05-24-77	(none)
		State Routes 41 and 180, Fresno, California	70639	05-24-77	(none)
		Freeway 592, Polk and Warren Counties, Iowa	70640	05-24-77	(none)
		SE Extension of S.R. 9-A,I-95/295-Jacksonville	70652	05-26-77	(none)
		SR 14, Kennewick Vicinity	70674	05-31-77	(none)
	SUPPLEME	US 18-151 Corridor,Dodgeville-Mt. Horeb (S-1)	70539	05-02-77	(none)
		S.R. 44, San Ysidro-north (S-2)	70632	05-24-77	(none)
Urban Mass Transportation Administration					
	DRAFT	Buffalo Light Rail Rapid Transit	70657	05-26-77	(none)
ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMIN.					
	FINAL	Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant Site	70621	05-23-77	(none)
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY					
	DRAFT	Jackson Wastewater Treatment System	70598	05-17-77	(none)
		So. Kennebec Valley Water Quality Plan	70618	05-20-77	(none)
		CSDOC Wastewater Management	70619	05-20-77	(none)
		Henrico Co. Wastewater Facilities	70651	05-26-77	(none)

FROM 05-01-77
TO 05-31-77

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

06-13-77

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

AGENCY BUREAU	STATUS	STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	NTIS ORDER NUMBER
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY					
	DRAFT	Standards for Lime Manufacturing Plants	70654	05-26-77	(none)
		York River Wastewater Facility	70664	05-31-77	(none)
	FINAL	Scarborough Wastewater Collection	70551	05-03-77	(none)
		El Paso & Teller Co. Water Quality Management	70623	05-23-77	(none)
FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION					
	DRAFT	McManus Generating Station, Plants 1 & 2	70658	05-26-77	(none)
	FINAL	Coal Conversion Program	70589	05-13-77	(none)
	SUPPLEM	Bayou Choctaw Salt Dome - SPR (S-1)	70586	05-13-77	(none)
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
	SUPPLEM	Fort Holabird Disposal, Amended (S-3)	70594	05-13-77	(none)
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION					
	FINAL	E. Cooper & Berkeley RR Co., Berkeley County Line	70553	05-04-77	(none)
OHIO RIVER BASIN COMMISSION					
	FINAL	Monongahela River Basin Study	70559	05-09-77	(none)
STATE DEPARTMENT					
	FINAL	AID Pest Management Program	70593	05-13-77	(none)
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY					
	DRAFT	Yellow Creek Nuclear Plant	70670	05-31-77	
U. S. POSTAL SERVICE					
	FINAL	Rochester General Mail Facility	70637	05-24-77	(none)
U.S. Coast Guard					
	DRAFT	Tanker Regs - Double Bottoms, Segregated Ballast	70587	05-13-77	(none)

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

AGENCY BUREAU	STATUS	STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	NTIS ORDER NUMBER
U.S.Coast Guard					
	DRAFT	Ohio R. Bridge & US 22, WVa.-Ohio	70615	05-20-77	(none)
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION					
	DRAFT	V.A. Replacement Hospital, Richmond	70606	05-19-77	(none)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Contact: Mr. Errett Deck
Coordinator
Environmental Quality Activities
U.S.Department of Agriculture
Room 359-A,
Washington, D.C. 20250
(202) 447-6827

Forest Service

Draft Date

San Gabriel Unit, Angeles N.F. 05/13

California
County: San Bernardino Los Angeles
This statement proposes several alternative land use management plans for the 186,570-acre San Gabriel Planning Unit, Angeles National Forest, California. The unit includes the 36,000-acre San Gabriel Wilderness, the 3,500-acre Cucamonga Wilderness Study Area, the 56,000-acre Sheep Mountain Wilderness Study Area, the 6,060-acre San Dimas undeveloped area, and the 17,000-acre San Dimas Experimental Forest. Impacts vary according to the alternate selected.
(ELR ORDER # 70590)

Big Creek Dam, Selway Bitteroot Area 05/20

Montana
County: Ravalli
Proposed is the reconstruction of the existing Big Creek Dam in the 1,239,840-acre Selway-Bitteroot Wilderness, Montana. The statement discusses the importance of stored water provided by the dam in maintaining agricultural production on 5,250 acres of land owned by the 44 shareholders who operate the dam under special use permit. Alternative methods of reconstruction are analyzed, and the use of motorized equipment is proposed both for transporting materials to the site and in construction. Adverse impacts include disturbance of vegetation and soil, and subjection of the lake system and its fishery to unnatural water level fluctuations.
(ELR ORDER # 70613)

Eagle Creek Dam & Reservoir 05/03

New Mexico
County: Lincoln Otero
Proposed is the construction of an earthen and rock fill dam on Eagle Creek to provide domestic water storage for the Village of Ruidoso. The reservoir will cover approximately 70 surface acres. A section of State Highway 532, 0.8 mile in length, and a small local service

powerline will be inundated. The highway and powerline would be relocated as part of the project.
(ELR ORDER # 70549)

Vegetation Management w/ Herbicides, ORE/WAS/CAL 05/19

Oregon Washington California
The proposed action is the reduction of unwanted vegetation, with herbicides, as a part of resource management activities on National Forest lands. The action covered by this EIS involves the use of the following herbicides: 2,4-D, 2,4,5-T, silvex, atrazine, dicamba, dalapon, amitrole-T, picloram, monosodium methanearsenate, Krenite, and cacodylic acid. All counties in the states of Oregon and Washington which contain Forest Service lands plus Del Norte and Siskiyou Counties of California are involved.
(ELR ORDER # 70603)

Illinois Wild & Scenic River Proposal 05/24

Oregon
County: Josephine Curry
This statement recommends that 50 miles of the Illinois River be considered as an addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The recommendation is to classify the river as follows: 3.8 miles from the mouth of the Illinois upstream to Nancy Creek as recreational; 28.7 miles from Nancy Creek upstream to Briggs Creek as wild; and 17.9 miles from Briggs Creek upstream to the Siskiyou National Forest boundary as scenic. The river segments are located in Josephine and Curry Counties, Oregon, all within the Siskiyo National Forest boundary.
(ELR ORDER # 70643)

Mt. Hood Meadows Ski Area 05/31

Oregon
County: Hood River
Proposed is the expansion of the Mt. Hood Meadows Ski Area in Oregon. Alternatives for the master plan range from limited expansion for day use to a year-round resort development. The ski area is located on the southeast side of Mt. Hood and has a present capacity of 3500 skiers at one time. Adverse impacts include wildlife displacement, soil erosion, and disturbance of the elk herd which utilizes the area.
(ELR ORDER # 70680)

Final Date

Boulder Planning Unit, Kaniksu N.F. 05/02

Idaho
County: Boundary

The statement refers to a land use plan for the Boulder Planning Unit, Kaniksu National Forest. The proposed plan would allocate resources and specify land use prescriptions for National Forests lands only, which make up 96%, or 55,640 acres, of the 58,000 acres within the planning unit. The selected alternate was developed through a land use allocation process which utilizes current resource inventories to determine the capability and suitability of the land to support its various uses. Adverse impacts will result from timber harvest activity.
COMMENTS MADE BY: COE DOI EPA FPC
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70542)

Ninemile-Mill Unit Plan, Lolo N.F. 05/09

Montana
County: several
The prposed action is the implementation of a revised multiple use plan for the Ninemile-Mill Planning Unit, Lolo National Forest. This action affects 120,950 acres of National Forest land of which 115,262 acres are in Missoula County, 5,120 acres are in Mineral County, 330 acres are in Lake County, and the remaining 238 acres are in Sanders County. Adverse effects include alteration of the natural landscape and disturbance of the natural condition of vegetation, soil, water, and wildlife.
COMMENTS MADE BY: FPC EPA DOI
state agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70566)

Mount Hebgen Management Alternatives 05/18

Montana
County: Gallatin
Proposed is the issuance of a special use permit to Ski Yellowstone, Inc., to develop ski facilities on Mount Hebgen, Montana. The plan consists of the construction of a mountain-top restaurant, an 8,300-foot long gondola, and 11 double chair lifts serving 637 acres of ski slopes and trails. The facility, to be built over a 10-year period, will have a capacity of 6,500 skiers. Negative impacts include minor slope instability, soil erosion, increased demands on existing facilities, and degradation of air due to increased automobile emissions.
COMMENTS MADE BY: FEA FPC USDA COE DOI EPA
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70600)

Ophir-Dog-Macdonald Pass, Helena N.F. 05/19

Montana

County: Powell Lewis Clark
The proposed action is the preparation and implementation of an intensive Multiple Use Plan for Ophir-Dog-Macdonald Pass Planning Unit, Helena N.F. The action will affect 50,600 acres of forest land and include the following major changes: a slight reduction in harvest of timber, more emphasis on production of red meat, and more specific direction on management of recreation and unroaded areas. Adverse impacts include soil movement, damage to residual vegetation, and restriction of motorized traffic in some areas.
COMMENTS MADE BY: HUD AHP EPA DOI USDA OEO
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70607)

W. Spruce Budworm Suppression & Evaluation 05/18

New Mexico
County: Sandoval Rio Arriba
Proposed is the evaluation of the western spruce budworm and its effects on forestry resources on 74,848 acres of Federal and Indian lands. To properly conduct this evaluation, it will be necessary to chemically treat 37,450 acres of the total acreage; 34,000 acres on the Santa Fe National Forest and 3,450 acres on the Jemez Publo Indian Reservation, New Mexico. Carbaryl (Servin R-4-Oil) will be the insecticide used, and will be applied at the recommended dosage rate of 1 lb. of active ingredient in an oil carrier to make up 64 ounces of material per acre. Pesticide impacts are evaluated.
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOI DOT COE EPA HEW
state organizations
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70602)

Deerfield R. Area Plan, Green Mt. N.F. 05/24

Vermont
County: Windham
Proposed is the implementation of a land use plan for the Deerfield River Area of the Green Mountain National Forest, Vermont. The proposed plan will provide specific direction for management, allocation, use, and development of approximately 2,860 acres of National Forest land, of which more than 500 acres have been developed for winter sports activities under the provisions of three special use permits. Adverse effects include some stream siltation, some soil disturbance, and the removal of 48 acres of timber land from production.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOT DOI HUD HEW COE EPA
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70641)

Oregon Butte Unit Plan, Umatilla N.F. 05/03

Washington Oregon
The proposed Oregon Butte Unit Land Use Plan sets forth the allocation of 404,840 acres of National Forest land to various resource uses and activities. This land is on the Umatilla National Forest in Asotin, Columbia, Garfield, and Walla Walla Counties, Washington, and Union, Umatilla, and Wallowa Counties, Oregon. Adverse effects include displacement of certain wildlife species, some increase in sedimentation, and intermittent reduction in air quality.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI COE EPA FPC USDA
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70550)

Supplement Date

Alaskan N. Forests, Herbicide Use (S-2) 05/12

Alaska
This statement is a final addendum to the final EIS on the use of herbicides on the National Forests of Alaska in 1977. The proposed action is control of vegetation through the use of herbicides on road, railroad, and powerline rights-of-way. The herbicides proposed for use include 2,4-D, picloram, amitrole, sodium metaborate, sodium chlorate, and bromacil. Susceptible target and non-target vegetation in the treatment areas will be reduced in vigor and, in most cases, killed.
(ELR ORDER # 70581)

1976 Coop. W. Spruce Budworm Plan (S-1) 05/09

Washington
County: several
This statement is a final addendum to a final EIS filed with CEQ in 1976 on the Western Spruce Budworm Pest Management Plan. Based on entomological and biological considerations, the USDA-Forest Service, in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, USDI-Bureau of Indian Affairs, and USDI-Bureau of Land Management, will treat western spruce budworm on 460,000 acres out of a total infestation of 1,100,020 acres in the spring and summer of 1977. The method of treatment will be aerial application of carbaryl (Sevin 4 Oil). Application of the chemical will result in reduction of wild bee populations, microathopods, and aquatic insect populations.
(ELR ORDER # 70568)

Rural Electrification Administration

Draft Date

Beluga Sta. # 7,8,9-Bernice Lake Unit 3 05/12

Alaska
Proposed is the granting of financial assistance to Chugach Electric Association for the construction of additional generating capacity at the Beluga Station and the Bernice Lake Power Plant in Alaska. Plans include expansion of Units 7,8, and 9 at the Beluga Station, located 40 air miles west and across Cook Inlet from Anchorage, and expansion of Unit 3 at the Bernice Lake Power Plant, located at Nikiski, within the Kenai Peninsula Borough. The major impact resulting from the action will be release of some oxides of nitrogen from the new generating station facilities.
(ELR ORDER # 70582)

Soil Conservation Service

Draft Date

Marshyhope Creek Watershed 05/23

Maryland Delaware
Proposed is the implementation of a plan for watershed protection, flood prevention, and drainage for Kent and Sussex Counties, Deleware, and Carolina and Dorchester Counties, Maryland, to be installed by the local sponsors with Federal assistance. The project consists of land treatment measures on 104,798 acres and about 260 miles of multi-purpose channel work. Adverse effects include the drainage of approximately 1,100 acres of type 1 and type 2 wetlands and 72 acres of type 7 wetlands immediately adjacent to the channels. Grassland will be decreased by 2,380 acres.
(ELR ORDER # 70620)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Contact: Dr. Sidney R. Galler
Deputy Assistant Secretary for
Environmental Affairs
Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-2186

Nat'l Oceanic and Atmospheric Admin.

Draft	Date
Atlantic Clam Fishery Management	05/13

The Mid-Atlantic Regional Fisheries Management Council has proposed the adoption of this management plan for surf clam and ocean quahogs caught off the Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern U.S. The objectives of the plan are to: rebuild the declining Surf Clam stocks within a 10 year period; minimize the short term economic dislocation to the extent possible consistent with the rebuilding of the surf clam stocks, and promote economic efficiency; and prevent overfishing of the ocean quahog stocks. Few adverse effects are anticipated.
(ELR ORDER # 70592)

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Contact:
Mr. Glen Simpson
Bureau of Economic Analysis
Consumer Product Safety Commission
5401 Westbard Avenue
Room 533
Washington, D.C. 20207
(301) 492-6542

Final	Date
Lead Content in Paint, Hazardous Product Ban	05/31

Proposed is the banning of several items containing lead paint as hazardous products. They include: lead containing paint and similar surface coating materials containing more than .06% lead; toys and other articles intended for use by children bearing lead-containing paint or other similar surface-coating materials containing more than .06% lead; and articles of furniture containing paint or other similar surface coating materials containing more than .06% lead. The effect of the regulation will be that no lead may be intentionally added to paints or coatings used for painted surfaces intended for consumer use.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOC HEW
state and local agencies
interested parties
(ELR ORDER # 70679)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Army

Contact:
Col. Charles Sell
Chief, Environmental Office
Department of the Army
Room 1E673, Pentagon Chief of Staff
Washington, D.C. 20310
(202) 694-4269

Draft Date

Operation RMT, Chemical Materiel Transport 05/19

Colorado Utah

The proposed action involves the movement of GB nerve agent filled Weteye Bombs from Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Denver, Colorado, to Tooele Army Depot, Tooele, Utah. The munitions will be moved across the Arsenal by truck convoy to Stapleton International Airport, then loaded onto USAF C-141 cargo aircraft and flown to the Michael Army Airfield at Dugway Proving Ground. The movement from Dugway Proving Ground to Tooele Army Depot will be by truck convoy. The potential for an accident resulting in release of the chemical agency has been evaluated and is considered to be minimal.
(ELR ORDER # 70611)

Final Date

Ground Squirrel Control, Fort Ord Complex 05/20

California
County: Monterey San Luis Obispo

Proposed is the significant reduction of ground squirrel populations occupying large areas of grassland and woodland-grassland on Fort Ord, Fort Hunter Liggett and Camp Roberts, located in Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties. This action would treat the open range ground squirrel habitat at Fort Hunter Liggett and Camp Roberts. The EIS recommends the use of pesticide 1080; the Department of the Army, however, prefers the alternative that would substitute the use of zinc phosphide. Adverse effects includ the reduction of non-target populations such as other seed-eating rodents like meadow voles, kangaroo rats, field mice, and seed-eating birds dut to secondary poisoning.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI DOT USDA DOD HEW EPA concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70617)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Army Corps

Contact: Dr. C. Grant Ash
Office of Environmental Policy Department
Attn: DAEN-CWR-P
Office of the Chief of Engineers
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
1000 Independence Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20314
(202) 693-6795

Draft Date

Duluth Stormwater Flood Control (2) 05/03

Minnesota
County: several
Proposed is the Duluth Stormwater Flood Control Project, which includes both structural and non-structural measures. The selected plan consists of structural measures to accomodate the 100-year or 1-percent flood on 14 of the 42 study area streams. Floodplain regulation and flood insurance will be used exclusively on the remaining 28 study area streams. Erosion control features are proposed for 6 of the 14 streams. Structural modifications include three floodwater impoundments, channel protection measures, bypass conduits along new routes, and enlargement of numerous existing drainage structures. Short term adverse impacts would result from construction. (St. Paul District) (ELR ORDER # 70548)

Packer R. Terminal, Barge Terminal Expansion 05/12

Minnesota
County: Dakota
The proposed action is expansion of an existing barge terminal in South St. Paul, Minnesota, by the Packer River Terminal Inc. (Packer). Packer plans to fill approximately 22 acres of wetlands to increase the capacity of their terminal to store and handle an estimated additional 635,000 tons of commodities per year. The primary impact would result from loss of the wetlands, which presently serve the functions of water quality, food chain production, general habitat, nesting and rearing habitat, and flood storage. Also, the habitat value of adjacent wetlands would be reduced.
(ELR ORDER # 70585)

Harlan County Lake O & M 05/24

Nebraska
County: Harlan
Proposed is the continued operation and maintenance of Harlan County Lake in Harlan County, Nebraska, which consists of water control operations, operation and maintenance

of recreation areas, and management of project land and water resources. Adverse effects of continued operation and maintenance include shoreline erosion, water level fluctuation, downstream releases, and effect on insect populations. (Kansas City District)
(ELR ORDER # 70633)

Pembilier Lake & Dam (2) 05/09

North Dakota
County: Pembina Cavalier
The proposed project calls for the construction of a rolled earth type dam across the Pembina River about 2 miles southwest of Walhalla, North Dakota, near the Cavalier-Pembina County Line. The reservoir would have a controlled storage capacity of 147,000 acre-feet of which 15,000 acre-feet would be in an 800 foot surface area conservation pool. Storage within the conservation pool would be allocated to water supply, recreation, and sedimentation. The project would result in the permanent inundation of about 800 acres of the valley. (St. Paul District)
(ELR ORDER # 70570)

Port Clinton Harbor, Maintenance Operations 05/12

Ohio
County: Ottawa
The proposed action is the intermittent dredging of the existing navigation channel at Port Clinton Harbor, Ohio. Structural maintenance of the existing jetties, by replacing the rubble and improving the safety for pedestrian uses, would be performed when necessary. An open area of Lake Erie and possible beach nourishment areas have been proposed for disposal of dredged materials. In the dredging, disposal, and repair areas, temporary turbid conditions will be created and water quality will decline, disturbing or destroying aquatic life. (Detroit District)
(ELR ORDER # 70578)

Big Creek Flood Protection Project 05/31

Ohio
County: Cuyahoga
The proposed project consists of construction of a floodway and diversion channel in Cleveland, Ohio. The facility includes 4,250 feet of floodway, and extends from near the upstream side of Cleveland Zoo to the downstream side of Protection Products. The project will provide 100-year flood protection for recreational and industrial facilities. Seventeen acres of flood plain will be altered and seven acres of woodland will be lost.
(ELR ORDER # 70677)

Hartwell Lake, GEO/SC, O & M 05/19

South Carolina Georgia
Proposed is the continuance of the operation and maintenance program on Hartwell Lake, Savannah River. The operation and maintenance activities consist of reservoir regulation, flood control, hydroelectric power generation management of land resources and facilities, management of leases, easements and other outgrants, and project management and maintenance activities. Adverse effects associated with the operation of Hartwell Lake are: soil erosion and/or compaction, damage to or loss of vegetation, and alterations of the natural environment through recreational development. (Savannah District)
(ELR ORDER # 70608)

Vince and Little Vince Bayous 05/31

Texas
County: Harris
The proposed action is completion of the Vince and Little Vince Bayous, which are Federal flood control projects located in Harris County, Texas. The plans call for enlargement and straightening of about 7.2 miles of Vince Bayou and about 4.2 miles of Little Vince Bayou. The action will disturb or remove wildlife and vegetation and cause increases in air and noise pollution due to construction activities. (Galveston District)
(ELR ORDER # 70676)

Racine Harbor, Interim II 05/26

Wisconsin
County: Racine
Proposed is the construction of a small-boat harbor on the western shore of Lake Michigan near the mouth of the Root River, in the city of Racine, Wisconsin. The purpose of the project is to provide both additional permanent harbor facilities and a harbor-of-refuge for light-draft vessels. The plan provides 32 acres of sheltered water in the southwest corner of the existing Federal harbor at Racine by constructing the two new interior breakwaters and raising the height of the existing south breakwater. The action will result in increases in noise levels and turbidity, destruction of 29 acres of benthos, and conversion of 6 acres of habitat. (Chicago District)
(ELR ORDER # 70656)

Final Date

North Point Park/Marina 05/27

California
County: San Francisco
Proposed is the construction of a major commercial/recreational complex at the Port of San Francisco's

northern waterfront. The project will include restaurants, retail shops, a marina, a parking garage, and open space/park areas adjacent to and including Piers 37, 38, and 41. Adverse effects include increased local traffic, sedimentation from the construction of breakwaters, and air, water, and noise pollution.
(San Francisco District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOC DOI DOT EPA AHP
state and local agencies
railway companies
(ELR ORDER # 70660)

S. Platte R. Flood Control, Chatfield Dam 05/25

Colorado
County: Arapahoe Adams Douglas
Proposed is the construction of structural and non-structural features for flood control for 8 miles of the South Platte River, Nebraska. The project area extends from Chatfield Dam to West Hampden Avenue, and plans call for acquisition of a flood plain area for recreational use and enlargement of segments of the existing channel. Safe evacuation of flood waters and erosion protection will be provided, as well as protection of overbank areas from flood waters. Adverse impacts include some alteration of wildlife and relocation of certain public utilities and bridges. (Omaha District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOI EPA HUD DOT HEW
state and local agencies
interested persons
(ELR ORDER # 70648)

Indian River Power Station, Unit 4 05/06

Delaware
County: Sussex
Proposed is the construction of Unit 4 of the Indian River Power Station in Sussex County, Delaware.The Delmarva Power and Light Company has proposed the addition to the station of a 400-megawatt bituminous coal-fired electric generating unit and associated structures. The project would utilize an additional 217 acres along the Indian River and a tributary, Island Creek. Adverse effects include changes in the temperature and salinity of the water, increased salt deposition on adjacent land, decreased visibility due to smoke from the cooling tower, and the loss of 175 acres of woodland due to dry-ash disposal. (Philadelphia District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI EPA DOC USDA HUD FEA
(ELR ORDER # 70555)

Punta Gorda Isles, Inc.-Section 15 (Permit) 05/13

Florida
County: Charlotte

This statement concerns the application by Punta Gorda Isles, Inc., for a permit to conduct activities in the navigable waters of the United States for the purpose of constructing a boat lock in a canal connecting to the north branch of Alligator Creek. The development involves approximately 922 acres. The proposed work would cause the removal of the mangrove and Juncus Grass communities, and would adversely affect water quality. Approximately 146 acres of wetlands would be filled. (Jacksonville District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOC HEW DOI EPA
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70588)

Big South Fork National River 05/24

Kentucky Tennessee
County: several
Proposed is the establishment, administration, and maintenance of the Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area, Tennessee and Kentucky, as authorized by P.L. 93-251. The purpose of establishing such a National Area is to conserve and interpret the natural resource values of the area and to preserve a natural free-flowing stream. A variety of recreation facilities will be provided. The project will result in displacement of 42 farms, 125 persons, 2 churches, and 13 cemeteries, as well as loss of significant timber harvest, and loss of coal, gas, and oil production. (Nashville District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: FPC USDA HEW EPA TVA
state agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70631)

Removal of Water Hyacinth, Aquatic Plant Control 05/09

Louisiana
This statement discusses two actions which are similar in scope. The first project consists of the removal of water hyacinth and other plants from navigable waters of Louisiana, so far as they are or may become an obstruction to navigation. The second action is the control and progressive eradication of water hyacinth, alligator-weed, Eurasian watermilfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths from navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States. The primary effort under these programs is the spraying of herbicide 2, 4-D under strictly controlled conditions. No adverse effects are anticipated. (New Orleans District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOC DOI EPA AHP
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70564)

Vermilion Lock Replacement, Gulf ICW 05/10

Louisiana
County: Vermilion
This final EIS updates a revised draft EIS filed with CEQ in November, 1975. The project provides for construction of an earth-chambered sector-gated replacement lock for the existing Vermilion Lock, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Louisiana Section. The primary adverse impacts will be the loss of 806 acres of marsh and existing vegetation and wildlife, increased turbidity, and the loss of some benthic organisms. (New Orleans District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI DOC USDA DOT HEW AHP
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70573)

DeTour Recreational Boat Harbor 05/26

Michigan
County: Chippewa
Proposed is the establishment of recreational and refuge harbor facilities for small craft at DeTour, Chippewa County, Michigan. Dredging and construction operations associated with the project would temporarily degrade the aquatic environment. Permanent adverse effects include the removal of some benthic organisms and degradation in water quality due to increased boat activity. (Detroit District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: FPC AHP USDA DOC DOI EPA
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70650)

Reserve Mining Co. Discharge Structure (Permit) 05/06

Minnesota
County: Lake
The Reserve Mining Company proposes to install a heated water discharge structure in Lake Superior. This structure would enable Reserve's Lakeside Power Plant to discharge approximately 106,000 gpm of cooling water into Lake Superior. The delta stabilization dike would be an attempt to stabilize the tailings delta at Silver Bay and prevent the further release of abestiform fibers into Lake Superior. Adverse effects include the destruction of 5,850 acres of terrestrial habitat. About 4,420 acres of public land would be used along with 3.9 miles of State designated recreation trails and 8.1 miles of non-designated recreation trails. (St. Paul District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA USDA DOC HEW DOT USCG AHP FPC
(ELR ORDER # 70556)

Rosedale Harbor Navigation Improvements, Miss. 05/24

Mississippi

County: Bolivar Coahoma Sunflower
The proposed improvement project for Rosedale Harbor, Mississippi, calls for a channel 2.7 miles long and an access road 0.7 miles long located approximately 2 miles south of Rosedale. The features of this plan also call for a 9 X 150 foot channel, a 400 X 1000 foot turning basin, an access road with a 40-foot crown, and a 20-acre land fill to be used as an industrial park. Material dredged from the channel will be deposited on the east side of Log Loaders Chute to form the 20-acre land fill. Adverse effects include loss of woodland. (Vicksburg District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA USDA DOI HEW DOC HUD DOT
state agencies
interested parties
(ELR ORDER # 70634)

Lake of the Ozarks Crossing by 161 kV Line, Permit 05/27

Missouri
County: Camden
Proposed is the issuance of Department of the Army permits to Central Electric Power Cooperative, Jefferson City, Missouri, for proposed construction and installation of a 161 kV, three phase, five wire overhead electric power-line across the Osage River at lake mile 31.9 and across the Niangua River at lake mile 31.2 on the Lake of the Ozarks. Adverse effects include the elimination of 80 acres of forest cover and related wildlife habitat. (Kansas City District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA HEW HUD DOI DOT EPA FPC AHP
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70662)

Pebble Beach-Indianola Development Permit 05/20

New Jersey
County: Ocean
The statement concerns the permit application by the Mayer Corp. for the dredging and bulkheading of the Pebble Beach - Indianola area. The proposed action will allow the construction of approximately 88 single family residences in the northern portion of the largely completed site. Adverse impacts include destruction of marsh salt, elimination of vegetation and habitat on wetlands and low and upland forests, and temporary turbidity, noise and erosion. (Philadelphia District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOC DOI EPA HUD HEW
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70612)

Abiquiu Dam and Reservoir, O&M 05/26

New Mexico
County: Rio Arriba
Proposed is the continued operation and maintenance of Abiquiu Dam and Reservoir for flood damage reduction and sediment retention. The project also includes the development of recreation facilites and zoning of project lands. Approximately 1,500 acres of interspersed grassland and juniper woodland would be converted to a standing aquatic system, and archeological sites may be inundated.
(Albuquerque District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: HEW AHP DOI EPA USDA
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70655)

Wilkerson Creek Bridge, Replacement 05/05

North Carolina
County: Hyde
The project involves the replacement of an obsolete swing-span highway bridge across the Atlantic Intracostal Waterway (AIWW) at Wilkerson Creek with a high-level, fixed-span bridge. The proposed new bridge would improve traffic flow on US 264, reduce traffic hazards created by the narrow bridge, and improve the flow of land and waterborne traffic. The action will result in the elimination of 38 acres of second-growth pine woodland, and some short term construction-related impacts. (Wilmington District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA HEW AEC USCG DOT DOI USDA
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70554)

Tulsa Urban Renewal River Parks Proj., Permit 05/27

Oklahoma
County: Tulsa
Proposed is the granting of a Department of the Army permit to the Tulsa Urban Renewal Authority for the placement of dredged and fill material in connection with bank stabilization, bank re-alignment and a low water sein. The proposed work would be located on and in the Arkansas River in the center of Tulsa, Oklahoma. Construction of the park will remove a portion of the stream side habitat, eliminate wildlife corridors, destroy nesting and breeding areas, and temporarily increase siltation and turbidity.
(Tulsa District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: FPC AHP USCG EPA DOT
state and local agencies
(ELR ORDER # 70661)

Red River Chloride Control 05/18

Texas Oklahoma
Proposed is the construction of five low-flow dams, three

subsurface cut-off walls, two shallow wells, collection systems, and installation of associated pumps and pipelines for collecting, transporting and storing brine-laden waters. There will be a total of about 11,900 acres of land eventually inundated with brine. The brine will cause a progressive degradation of the soil and vegetation, causing displacement of land animals. The aesthetic conditions surrounding the brine pools may be regarded as an encroachment upon a wild landscape by man-made features. (Tulsa District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP DOI HEW DOC HUD DOT USDA EPA
state agencies
(ELR ORDER # 70604)

Appalachian Power Co. Power Plant, New Haven 05/13

West Virginia
County: Mason
Proposed is the construction and operation of a 1,300,000 kV coal-fired power plant in New Haven, West Virginia. The plant will use cooling water from the Ohio River and will discharge station waste to the river. Adverse impacts of the project include the discharge of waste from ash disposal and station drains, and passage of water through the station system, the use of chemical additives to water used in the station system, and the breakdown of the pollution control system. The project will also require the clearing of forest land and the relocation of Little Broad Run. (Huntington District)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI USDA DOC FPC DOT ORBC AHP
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70591)

Supplement Date

Inland Waterway, Del. R. - Chesapeake Bay (S-1) 05/16

Delaware Maryland
This statement supplements a final EIS filed with CEQ in May 1974, and addresses discussion which has taken place since the completion of the Final EIS between the Corps, EPA, the Maryland Department of Resources, and interested public concerning the maintenance dredging program and its environmental effects. The supplement synopsizes the results of two ad hoc studies of the maintenance dredging program.
(ELR ORDER # 70596)

Tampa Harbor Deepening (S-2) 05/24

Florida
County: Hillsborough
This statement supplements a final EIS filed with CEQ in July, 1975 on the Tampa Harbor Deepening Project. It

presents a revised disposal plan which alters the plan presented in the Final EIS together with additional information, data, planning status, and coordination efforts which have been acquired or have occurred since the filing of the Final EIS. Adverse effects of the revised disposal plan are discussed. (Jacksonville District)
(ELR ORDER # 70642)

Buena Vista Flood Protection (S-1) 05/09

Virginia
County: Rockbridge
Proposed is the Buena Vista Flood Protection Project which provides for flood protection measures consisting of an 11,700-foot levee and floodwall, a 200-foot wide channel 2,800 feet long, a 5,700-foot interior drainage canal and three closures. Adverse effects include the covering of 72 acres of low-use habitat with levee and floodwall, loss of vegetation on riverbank adjacent to channel, and increased rate of sedimentation into the Maury River during construction. Relocation of businesses, utilities, and transportation facilities will also result. (Norfolk District)
(ELR ORDER # 70563)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Navy

Contact: Mr. Ed Johnson
Department of the Navy
Room 4B466, Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20350
(202) 697-3639

Draft | Date

San Diego Naval Sta., Berthing/Repair Pier #2 | 05/11

California
County: SAN DIEGO

Proposed is the construction of a reinforced concrete pier 120 feet wide by 1,005 feet long at the Naval Station, San Diego, California. The project site of the proposed new berthing pier #2 will be midway between berthing piers #1 and 3, where the water is approximately 300 feet MLLW. The project will deepen the area to 35 MLLW and the dredged material will be disposed of about 8 miles west of Point Loma. Dredging will temporarily disturb marine and bottom life.

(ELR ORDER # 70576)

Final | Date

Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, Alaska | 05/27

Alaska

Proposed is the continuation of exploratory drilling for petroleum at 19 additional sites within Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 in northern Alaska. The purpose of the project is to explore, inventory, and evaluate the petroleum potential of NPR-4. Exploration activity will result in the removal, due to borrow, of as much as 350 acres of sand dune, gravel bar, or gravel beach habitat; and the covering , in the form of drill pads, airstrips, and access roads, of as much as 225 acres of tundra habitat with this borrow material.

COMMENTS MADE BY: DOC HUD DOI DOT USCG AHP EPA
state and local agencies
concerned citizens

(ELR ORDER # 70659)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Navy

Final	Date
Ready Missile Test Facility, Project P-875	05/18

California
County: Ventura
The proposed action is entitled Military Construction Project P-875: "Ready Missile Test Facility." This action involves the construction of 15 small buildings on 5 acres of mudflat at the Pacific Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California. It will involve dredging about 25,000 cubic yards of mud out of an intertidal mudflat and filling it in with about 100,000 cubic yards of sand. The purpose of the project is to provide facilities for testing air-launched missiles with line warheads and motors. Few adverse effects are anticipated.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOD EPA DOI AHP COE DOC
state and county agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70599)

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMIN.

Contact: Mr. W. Herbert Pennington
Office of NEPA Coordination
Energy Research and Development Administration
E-201, ERDA
Washington, D.C. 20545
(301) 353-4241

Final	Date
Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant Site	05/23

Ohio
County: Pike
Proposed is the continued operation of the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Piketon, Ohio. This statement assesses the environmental, social, and economic impacts, and the costs and benefits of continued operation of the plant at its uprated capacity of 8.6 million separating work units per year. Impacts associated with the offsite production of electric power to operate the plant are evaluated.

COMMENTS MADE BY: HEW DOI DOC EPA NRC
state agencies
concerned groups and persons

(ELR ORDER # 70621)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Contact: Ms. Rebecca W. Hanmer
Director, Office of Federal Activities
Room WSMW 537, 401 M Street, S.W.
Washington D.C. 20460
(202) 755-0777

Draft	Date
Standards for Lime Manufacturing Plants	05/26

Proposed is the implementation of standards of performance for new and modified rotary lime kilns and hydrators at lime manufacturing plants. The proposed standards limit emissions to 0.15 kilogram of particulate matter per megagram of limestone feed and 10 percent opacity. Beneficial impacts are anticipated.
(ELR ORDER # 70654)

CSDOC Wastewater Management 05/20

California
County: Orange
The proposed action is the construction of additional treatment facilities at the County Sanitation Districts of Orange County, California. The recommended alternative water pollution control projects consist of expansion of primary and secondary treatment capacity at the two regional wastewater treatment plants through the year 1996. The capacity of Plant #1, located in Fountain Valley, would be increased from 46 mgd to 126 mgd. Proposed additions to Plant #2, in Huntington Beach, would add 36 mgd of primary treatment to the present capacity of 138 mgd. Adverse effects include construction and operational impacts.
(Region IX)
(ELR ORDER # 70619)

So. Kennebec Valley Water Quality Plan 05/20

Maine
County: several
Proposed is the implementation of a two-year area-wide water quality plan for the Southern Kennebec Valley area in Maine. The planning process is subdivided into the following four major areas: 1) water quality, 2) waste reduction, 3) land use, and 4) management planning. One of the major goals of the plan is to maintain, or obtain for certain substandard waters, a quality capable of supporting water contact recreation. Waste reduction studies are included and address both point and non-point sources. Impacts vary according to the alternate selected. (Region 1)
(ELR ORDER # 70618)

Henrico Co. Wastewater Facilities 05/26

Virginia
County: Henrico
Proposed is construction of a wastewater treatment plant and a system of interceptor sewers to serve Henrico County and parts of Goochland and Hanover Counties, Virginia. Nine alternatives for wastewater transportation and treatment are considered in the statement. The action will result in habitat destruction, visual impact, and increased odor. (Region III)
(ELR ORDER # 70651)

York River Wastewater Facility 05/31

Virginia
County: York
Proposed is the construction of a 15 mgd sewage treatment plant on the York-James Peninsula, immediately west of Seaford, Virginia. The project, to be constructed for the Hampton Roads Sanitary District, will include treatment processes such as degritting, primary and secondary clarification, and single-step activated sludge aeration. Effluent from the facility will be chlorinated, dechlorinated, and discharged to the York River through a cooling water discharge of a nearby Virginia Electric Power Company electric generating station. Adverse effects include increased nutrient loading of the York River, reduction of stream flow, and loss of habitat. (Region III)
(ELR ORDER # 70664)

Jackson Wastewater Treatment System 05/17

Wyoming
County: Teton
Proposed is the provision of Federal matching funds for wastewater treatment for the town of Jackson, Wyoming, through the authority of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The town of Jackson proposes to build a stabilization lagoon system in the state-owned South Park Elk Feedground five miles south of the town. Because there are various difficulties associated with this option, EPA has decided not to fund the option. Alternative systems, which include lagoon systems located at three sites other than the Elk Feedground, are discussed extensively. (Region VIII)
(ELR ORDER # 70598)

Final Date

El Paso & Teller Co. Water Quality Management 05/23

Colorado
County: El Paso Teller
This statement proposes enactment of a Water Quality Manage-

ment Plan for El Paso and Teller Counties in Colorado. The plan makes recommendations regarding stream classifications and criteria, wastewater treatment facility needs, and the regulatory/fiscal/institutional programs necessary for implementation. Problems of point and nonpoint sources of water pollution are addressed for a projected population of 550,000 by the year 2000. Adverse effects include impacts to ecologic systems, a decrease in water discharged to Fountain and Monument Creeks, and an increase in demand for groundwater supplies. (Region VIII)
COMMENTS MADE BY: CEQ COE HEW HUD
state and county agencies
interested persons
(ELR ORDER # 70623)

Scarborough Wastewater Collection 05/03

Maine
County: Cumberland
Proposed is the design and construction of a sewage treatment plant for the Town of Scarborough, Maine. The project consists of construction of a series of interceptors, pumpstations, and force mains to service the six Consent Ordered areas plus Prout's Neck and Pleasant Hill. This 1.8 mgd facility is expected to serve a projected sewered population of 14,558 by the year 2000. The effluent from the new Oak Hill Treatment plant will be discharged to the Fore River in Sputh Portland. Long term adverse effects resulting from the action are related to impacts on land use, socioeconomic characteristics, and air and water quality. (Region I)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOC HUD DOI COE DOT EPA AHP
state and local agencies
(ELR ORDER # 70551)

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

Contact:
Mr. Robert Stern
Director, Office of Environmental Impact
Federal Energy Administration
New Post Office Building, Room 7119
12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20461
(202) 566-9760

Draft | Date

McManus Generating Station, Plants 1 & 2 | 05/26

Georgia
Proposed is the prohibition of the burning of gas or oil as the primary energy source at the Georgia Power Company's McManus Generating Station , powerplants 1 and 2, Brunswick, Georgia. The statement describes existing conditions and analyzes the impact of conversion to coal. Adverse impacts vary according to the pollution control strategy employed.
(ELR ORDER # 70658)

Final | Date

Coal Conversion Program | 05/13

This statement proposes FEA's issuance of orders to fossil fuel-fired facilities prohibiting them from burning natural gas or petroleum products as their primary energy source and requiring facilities in the early stages of planning to be built with the capability of burning coal. The following impacts are generally associated with coal burning and vary in degree from site to site: 1)an increase in emissions of air pollutants, 2)increases in solid waste generation, 3)potential increases in land requirements, 4)increases in water pollution, and 5)increases in coal mining, processing, and transport.
COMMENTS MADE BY: ICC USDA FPC EPA HEW NRC
state agencies
(ELR ORDER # 70589)

Supplement | Date

Bayou Choctaw Salt Dome - SPR (S-1) | 05/13

Louisiana
County: Iberville
This statement supplements a final EIS filed with CEQ in December, 1976. Proposed is the implementation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, Title I, Part B of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 through the development of a 94 million barrel crude oil storage facility at the Bayou Choctaw Salt Dome. The oil transportation

proposed in the final EIS has been revised to provide direct connections by pipeline to the existing oil distribution system at St. James, Louisiana. This supplement is concerned with the construction and operation of this revised oil distribution system.
(ELR ORDER # 70586)

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Contact: Mr. Andrew E. Kauders
Executive Director, Environmental Affairs Division
General Services Administration
18th and F Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20405
(202) 566-1100

Supplement	Date
Fort Holabird Disposal, Amended (S-3)	05/13

Maryland
County: Baltimore
This statement supplements a final EIS filed with CEQ in November, 1975. Proposed is the disposal of 226.85 acres of Fort Holabird, Baltimore City and Baltimore County, Maryland. This acreage will be disposed of as follows: 1) approximately 179.20 acres through negotiated sale with the city of Baltimore for general public purposes; 2) approximately 37 acres by assignment to BOR for conveyance to the city of Baltimore for park and recreational purposes; 3) approximately 4 acres by assignment to BOR for conveyance to Baltimore County for park and recreational purposes; and 4) approximately 6.65 acres through Sealed Bid Sale. (ELR ORDER # 70594)

DEPARTMENT OF HUD

Contact:
Mr. Richard H. Broun
Director, Office of Environmental Quality
Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20410
(202) 755-6308

Draft Date

Kensington Park Apartments 05/31

Colorado
Proposed is the sale by HUD of Kensington Park Phases I and II in Denver, Colorado. The project, which consists of 32 buildings containing 628 living units, was constructed under mortgages insured by HUD. Concerns regarding disposition are mainly in regard to the development's location within the Denver Air Quality Control Region, which exceeds State and Federal Standards; the lack of storm drainage in Phase II; and the high incidence of sewer backups in Phase I.
(ELR ORDER # 70668)

Bellehaven/Vista Grande Terrace/Clear View Estates 05/31

Colorado
County: El Paso
Proposed is the issuance of HUD/FHA mortgage insurance for the developers of Bellehaven, Vista Grand Terrace, and Clear View estates to build 205 single family detached units 24 single family detached units, and 380 single family detached units, respectively. The former two developments are located in Colorado Springs and the latter in El Paso County. Adverse impacts include increased levels of air pollution, greater pressure on local facilities, and destruction of wildlife habitat.
(ELR ORDER # 70675)

Maple Grove & Boundary Creek Additions 05/02

Minnesota
County: Hennepin
Proposed is the provision of HUD mortgage insurance under Section 203(b) for the 1170 dwelling unit Boundary Creek Development in the city of Maple Grove, Minnesota. The development, bound on the north by the city of Chaplin, and on the east by the city of Brooklyn Park, is approximately 15 miles from the Minneapolis Central Business District, and covers an area of one square mile. A small, three-acre neighborhood shopping center is also planned to serve the residential project. Adverse effects include increased noise pollution, and an increased demand for public services and facilities.
(ELR ORDER # 70543)

Sommerall Subdivision, Texas 05/02

Texas
County: Harris
Proposed is the development of 273.82 acres into a planned community composed of single-family homes, with some commercial reserves in Harris County, Texas. The development provides for the planning and controlling of a wide range of living accomodations for approximately 4200 people. Adverse effects would include the loss of agricultural land and an increased demand for fossil fuels through heavy dependence on the the automobile for transporation.
(ELR ORDER # 70546)

Mission Bend Subdivision 05/06

Texas
County: Harris Fort Bend
Proposed is the acceptance of an application by Fox & Jacobs, Inc. for approval of the Mission Bend Subdivision for home mortgage insurance purposes. The development plan includes the construction of 588 single family units on 134 acres. The average FHA insured house proposed for Mission Bend will have approximately 1700 sq. ft. and will contain, on the average, 3.5 bedrooms. Adverse impacts include disruption or destruction of plant and animal communities on the site, conversion of agricultural land to residential use, and increases in air and noise pollution.
(ELR ORDER # 70557)

Parkway Forest Subdivision 05/11

Texas
County: Harris
Proposed is the approval, for mortgage insurance purposes, of the 543.42-acre Parkway Forest Subdivision in eastern Harris County, Texas. The development plan calls for construction of 2680 housing units with additional acreage reserved for commercial, open space, and recreational uses. Plant and animal communities currently existing on the site will be disrupted. The action will also result in increases in automobile traffic, vehicle emissions, and noise levels.
(ELR ORDER # 70574)

CandleRidge - So. Ridge Communities 05/12

Texas
County: Tarrant
Proposed is the approval of an application by CandleRidge Development Corporation and the Foster Financial Company

for FHA mortgage insurance for the proposed communities of CandleRidge and South Ridge. The 1,684-acre project is located 8 miles southwest of the Fort Worth Central Business District and is designed to accomodate a 1985 population of 15,500 persons with a housing supply of 5,664 units. Of these units, 2,796 are low-density single family homes, 1,164 units are medium-density apartments, and another 1,704 units are cluster housing, condominiums, townhomes and duplexes. Adverse effects include loss of prairie lands, and degradation of water.
(ELR ORDER # 70583)

Sherwood Trails Subdivision 05/19

Texas
County: Harris
Proposed is the development of 200.592 acres into a community composed of single-family homes in Kingwood, Texas. The development will be designed to accomodate approximately 3,234 persons. Adverse effects include the loss of wooded land and an increased demand for fossil fuels through heavy dependence on the automobile for transportation.
(ELR ORDER # 70605)

Willowridge Subdivision 05/24

Texas
County: Harris Fort Bend
Proposed is the development of 4,200 acres into a planned community composed of single-family homes, apartments, patio homes and townhomes with some commercial reserves in Fort Bend and Harris Counties, Texas. The development provides for the planning and controlling of a wide range of living accomodations for approximately 50,000 or more people.
(ELR ORDER # 70627)

Sterling Green Subdivision 05/24

Texas
County: Harris
Proposed is the development of 1200 acres into a planned community composed of single-family homes, apartments, patio homes and townhomes with some commercial reserves in Harris County, Texas. This development provides for the planning and controlling of a wide range of living accomodations for approximately 26,500 people. Adverse effects would include the loss of agricultural land and an increased demand for fossil fuels through heavy dependence on the automobile for transportation.
(ELR ORDER # 70628)

Inwood North Subdivision 05/24

Texas
County: Harris
The proposed action is for the Department of HUD to accept for HUD-FHA mortgage insurance purposes the 760 acre Inwood North Subdivision in Harris County, Texas. When completed in approximately six years, the subdivision will contain approximately 2000 single-family homes plus some attached single-family and multi-family housing and shopping and recreational facilities. Adverse effects include the removal of grazing land and open areas, and an increased demand for fossil fuels through heavy dependence on the automobile for transportation.
(ELR ORDER # 70630)

Wingate Subdivision 05/24

Texas
County: Harris
Proposed is the development of 127 acres into a planned community composed of single family homes, located in Harris County, Texas. This project will provide housing for approximately 2100 people. The development will result in increased loading of solid waste disposal sites, increased groundwater consumption, and increased demand for fossil fuels through heavy dependence upon the automobile for transportation.
(ELR ORDER # 70646)

Summerfields Community 05/26

Texas
Proposed is the approval for home mortgage purposes of the application of the Cambridge Realty Development Corporation for the 1,561-acre Summerfields Development nine miles north of Fort Worth. Of the 6024 units in the project, 3,132 are low-density single family homes, 1,464 units are medium density apartments, and another 1,428 units are cluster housing and other types of units. Adverse effects include higher air and noise pollution levels, urban runoff, and loss of croplands and pasturelands.
(ELR ORDER # 70653)

Rolling Green Subdivision 05/31

Texas
County: Harris
The proposed action is the approval, for HUD/FHA home mortgage insurance purposes, of the Rolling Green Project in Harris County, Texas. The 317-acre development would be composed of 1,270 single-family units and would provide housing for some 4500 people. Adverse effects would be the loss of agricultural land and an increased demand for fossil fuels through heavy dependence on the automobile for transportation.
(ELR ORDER # 70665)

Final Date

Northeast Suisan, 983-acre Development 05/18

California
County: Suisan Solano
The proposed action consists of the development of 953 acres of land in the northeastern portion of Suisan, Solano County, California. The project calls for the construction of 2468 single family units, 1220 medium density apartments, 1500 high density apartments, 2 potential schools, and commercial services. Potential adverse impacts include increased noise levels, and stress on the existing watersystem.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOT GSA ERDA VA AHP USDA USAF HEW
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70601)

Georgetown ASP 75-28 05/09

Georgia
County: Chatham
Proposed is the planned unit development of 2206 acres in Chatham County, Georgia. The planned land uses include single-family detached houses, apartments and townhouses, regional and neighborhood commercial areas, recreation facilities, a school complex, an office park, a warehouse/light industry area, an activity center and a sewage treatment plant. The major adverse impacts will be increased demands on schools and highways, and loss of agriculturally productive land.
COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP COE FPC ERDA EPA GSA USDA DOC HEW
DOI
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70565)

Second Waterfront Urban Renewal, Gloucester 05/23

Massachusetts
The statement concerns an urban renewal project for 43 acres of land located at the head of the North Channel of the City of Gloucester, Massachusetts. The project includes demolition of some existing structures and the construction of new wharves and piers, commercial buildings, a fish processing plant, a cold storage area, retail stores, and some office space. The program will also result in filling in the area at the terminus of Inner Harbor at the North Channel, the disposal of dredge, relocation and disruption of businesses, and the demolition of existing buildings.
COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP USDA COE DOC HEW DOI DOT ERDA EPA
state and regional agencies
local groups and persons
(ELR ORDER # 70624)

Section 104(h)

Draft Date

Santa Rosa, S. Park Neighborhood Development 05/09

California
County: Sonoma
This statement provides a comprehensive analysis of the environmental consequences of full implementation of the South Park Neighborhood Development Program in Santa Rosa, California. Redevelopment activities have been underway in the neighborhood for over three years and are anticipated to continue for another ten. Specific features of the plan are the rezoning of a seven-block area to be totally commercial, the expansion of a neighborhood park, and the construction of a new roadway completing a beltway around the neighborhood. Alternatives include cessation of redevelopment, and reduced funding.
(ELR ORDER # 70569)

Renton, Cedar River Trail System 05/09

Washington
County: King
Proposed is the construction of a continuous multi-use recreational system along the Cedar River from the mouth of the river at Lake Washington to the proposed King County Park, adjacent to the Maplewood Golf Course five miles up river. The project is to be completed in phases and includes three different environmental zones: the Industrial/Park Zone, the Urban Zone, and the Natural Zone. These areas fall directly within Census Tracts 253,256, and 257. Adverse impacts are expected to be minimal.
(ELR ORDER # 70571)

Final Date

Santa Cruz Riverpark, Tucson 05/23

Arizona
Proposed is a master plan for the Santa Cruz Riverpark in Tucson, Arizona, to be implemented over a ten to fifteen year period. The Riverpark is located west of Interstate highways I-10 and I-19 between the north limits of the City of Tucson at Camino del Cerro and the south City limits at Los Reales Road. Five major categories of interest are included in the project: land use, recreation, water management, other resource management, and implementation. Impacts, both beneficial and adverse, are discussed at length.
COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP DOI HUD DOT

state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70626)

Coalinga, Cal. - Sewer Line Extension 05/25

California
County: Fresno
Proposed is the extension of an existing sewer line from Maple Street north to Phelps Avenue (including an inverted siphon under Los Gatos Creek) in Fresno County, California. This extension will make approximately 160 acres of land available for development, including: limited industrial, service and commercial, recreational, light density residential, and park land uses. Present plans call for the property to be annexed to the City of Coalinga prior to construction of any facilities. Adverse effects include the loss of agricultural land and the displacement of some wildlife.
COMMENTS MADE BY: COE EPA
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70647)

Boise, Ida. - W. Boise Ave. Trunk Sewer 05/31

Idaho
Proposed is the development of the West Boise Avenue Relief Trunk Sewer in Boise, Idaho. The project would provide relief to the 18-inch Broadway Avenue line by diverting flow from the two 30-inch trunk sewers through a new 36-inch line down Boise Avenue. The relief sewer would connect with the existing 36-inch sewer line on Boise Avenue at Oakland Street. Adverse effects include increases in noise and dust during construction, and growth-related impacts following completion.
COMMENTS MADE BY: COE AHP
city agencies
interested parties
(ELR ORDER # 70671)

Helena, Mon. - Eastside #2 Sanitary Sewer 05/02

Montana
County: Lewis and Clar
The proposed action is the installation of 7,300 feet of sanitary sewer main in Helena, Montana. The sewer main, which varies in diameter from 12 to 24 inches, is an extension of an existing main, and will tie into a major outfall main 24 inches in diameter. Sewerage collected by the proposed facility flows to a sewage plant and is discharged, after secondary treatment, into Lake Helena. Construction impacts will result.
COMMENTS MADE BY: HEW EPA
local agencies

interested parties

(ELR ORDER # 70545)

Lawton, Oklahoma - Industrial Waterline 05/31

Oklahoma

Proposed is the construction of industrial utilities in the City of Lawton, Oklahoma. The project includes an industrial water storage tower, a water pump station at the existing seven million gallon tank, an industrial water line, and an industrial sewer line. Short term construction impacts will result.

COMMENTS MADE BY:

state agencies

interested parties

(ELR ORDER # 70667)

Memphis, Tenn. - New Chicago Area 05/12

Tennessee

Proposed are a number of improvements to the New Chicago area in Memphis, Tennessee. Plans include improvements to streets, curbs, gutters,and structures. The 2689-acre project area is in north Memphis, bounded by Wolf River on the north, Chelsea Avenue on the south, North Cypress Creek on the east, and an industrial complex on the west. No adverse effects are anticipated.

COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI

interested parties

(ELR ORDER # 70584)

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Contact: Mr. Bruce Blanchard
Director, Environmental Project Review
Room 5311
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-3891

Bonneville Power Administration

Draft	Date
FY 1978 Bonneville Dam Integrations Transmission	05/12

Washington
County: Clark Skamania

The proposed action is construction of transmission facilities to integrate the electricity from the second powerhouse at Bonneville Dam, in the State of Washington, into BPA's grid system. Two alternatives are discussed, both of which involve the construction of approximately 1.3 miles of new 230-kV line and the addition of 21 miles of conductor to the vacant side of existing BPA double circuit towers. Depending upon the final route location chosen, between 6 and 24 acres of new right-of-way would be required, and approximately 100 acres of trees and brush would be cleared for construction.
(ELR ORDER # 70579)

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Draft	Date
Vekol Hills Project, Papago Reservation	05/19

Arizona
County: Pinal

The proposed action is the approval by the Secretary of the Interior of (a) a Mining Lease Indian Lands, and (b) a Business Lease (Water Well Sites) on lands within the Papago Indian Reservation, Arizona. The Lessee of both leases will be the Vekol Copper Mining Company, a wholly owned subsidiary of the Newmont Mining Company; the Lessor will be the Papago Tribe of Arizona. The leases will be for the purpose of mining and producing copper, molybdenum, gold, and silver by conventional open pit methods. Approximately 1,600 acres of natural desert and foothill terrain will be affected.
(ELR ORDER # 70609)

Lower Truckee-Lower Carson R. Basins 05/19

Nevada
Proposed is the reduction of the amount of water diverted by the Newlands Reclamation Project from the Truckee River watershed in the Carson River Watershed, and the accomplishment of certain improvements in operation and management. (Under the long-term implementation of operating criteria for the Newlands Reclamation Project, the amount of water the project may use each year is reduced from 406,000 acre-feet to 288,100 acre feet.) As a result of this action, an annual average increase of 127,000 acre-feet in inflow to Pyramid Lake will occur and provide the basis for stabilization of the lake.
(ELR ORDER # 70610)

Bureau of Land Management

Final Date

Valdez-Midland, Crude Oil Transportation System 05/31

Alaska Texas
This statement discusses Standard Oil Company of Ohio's proposal for a transportation system for delivery of Alaska crude oil from the Trans-Alaska pipeline terminal at Valdez, Alaska, to Midland, Texas, where the oil could be distributed to refineries to the north and east. A tanker fleet would transport the crude oil 2,200 miles between Valdez and Long Beach, California. A 1,027-mile pipeline would transport the oil between Long Beach and Midland. Approximately 800 miles of existing natural gas pipeline would be abandoned and converted for the transporting of crude oil in the proposed system.
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOC DOD HEW HUD DOI DLAB DOT AHP EPA FPC
(ELR ORDER # 70669)

Navajo Reservation, Coal Lease & Mining Plan 05/11

New Mexico
County: San Juan
Proposed is the approval of a coal mining lease and associated mining and reclamation plan on the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico. The major enviromental impacts of the proposal will include substantial income to the Navajo Tribe, relocation of the Navajo people residing on the mining area, and the temporary disruption of all surface uses in the area. The audio-visual impact of strip mining and railroad operations, and the permanent alteration of topography also will result.
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOT ICC FEA HEW DOI
state agencies and Navajo Tribe
interested parties
(ELR ORDER # 70575)

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

Final Date

Continental Divide and Kit Carson Trails 05/09

Proposed is the designation of a 3,100-mile route from Canada to Mexico as the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail, pursuant to the National Trails System Act (P.L. 90-543). The designated trail would be limited to those sections already in existence on Federal lands, while new trail development would be deferred until the more immediate trail needs of population centers in the vicinity are met. Adverse impacts would occur for some of the trail segments due to anticipated increased use by hikers, horseback riders and pack animals, and increased disposal of wastes.

COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOT HUD EPA DOI
state and local agencies
interested parties

(ELR ORDER # 70567)

Bureau of Reclamation

Final Date

Colorado River Water Quality Program 05/20

Utah Nevada

Proposed is the construction of four salinity control units as a part of the initial stage of the Colorado River Water Quality Improvement Program. These units include Paradox Valley Unit, Colorado; The Grand Valley Unit, Colorado; the Crystal Geyser Unit, Utah; and the Las Vegas Wash Unit, Nevada. This statement presents cumulative impacts of the program and detailed impacts of the Las Vegas Wash and Crystal Geyser Units. Implementation of all salinity control units will reduce the salinity of the Colorado River at Imperial Dam by about 150 milligrams per liter.

COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI AHP USDA HEW STAT FPC FEA DOT EPA
state and local agencies
concerned citizens

(ELR ORDER # 70614)

De Luz Heights Municipal Water System 05/16

California
County: San Diego

The statement refers to the proposed construction of a pipe distribution system to convey water from the San Diego Aqueduct for the irrigation of 1,825 acres of potential avocado lands. Approximately 14 acres will be committed to the project; 1,625 acres of presently undeveloped land will be used

for agricultural purposes, disturbing existing wildlife habitat and stimulating rural development.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI EPA
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70595)

Dolores Project, Colorado 05/09

Colorado
County: Montezuma Dolores
The proposed project involves the diversion of water from the Dolores to the San Juan River Basin, Colorado. The project would include McPhee Reservoir on the Dolores River, the smaller Monument Creek and Dawson Draw Reservoirs in the San Juan River Basin, and two major conveyance systems. An average of 126,600 acre-feet of water annually would be developed for the irrigation of 26,300 acres of supplemental service land and 35,360 acres of full service land for municipal and industrial use, and for fish and wildlife enhancement. Adverse effects include relocation of 42 families, and the inundation of about 4,850 acres.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI AHP USDA DOD EPA HEW HUD DOT
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70562)

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Contact: Mr. Richard I. Chais
Chief, Section of Energy
and Environment
Room 3373
12th & Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20423
(202) 275-7692

Final	Date
E. Cooper & Berkeley RR Co., Berkeley County Line	05/04

South Carolina
County: Berkeley
Proposed is the granting of authority to South Carolina Public Railways Commission, in behalf of the East Cooper and Berkeley Railroad Company, to construct and operate a line of railroad in Berkely County, South Carolina. The 15.5 mile project runs between a connection with a mainline of the Seabound Coast Line Railroad at State Junction, located at milepost 393 between Codesville and Bethera, and the property of Amoco Chemical Corporation. Construction of this line will require the commitment of approximately 221 acres of undeveloped land. Operation of the facility will result in increased energy consumption and air pollution.
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA USDA DOI
state agencies
interested parties
(ELR ORDER # 70553)

OHIO RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Final	Date
Monongahela River Basin Study	05/09

Maryland Pennsylvania West Virginia
Proposed is adoption of the Monongahela R. Basin Plan for implementation of one major reservoir, one upstream watershed project, flood zoning and insurance at 13 locations, four local protection projects, 104 municipal wastewater treatment facilities, 130 mile drainage abatement areas, and the replacement of one navigation lock and one lock and dam. Adverse impacts of the plan include the inundation of 4,376 acres of open and green space, disruption of 55 miles of existing natural stream channel by four projects, and the possible loss of 2,650 acres of coal resources and associated jobs.
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA USA DOC HEW HUD DOI DOT ERDA FPC
EPA CEQ state agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70559)

STATE DEPARTMENT

Contact: Cameron Sanders
Director, Office of Environmental Affairs
Room 7822, Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520
(202) 632-7964

Final	Date
AID Pest Management Program	05/13

This EIS addresses all activities of the Agency for International Development (AID) which are intended to control or eliminate pests. Conceptually, the AID program is organized according to: (a) program area (food production and preservation, public health, and all other pest management programs); (b) program element (pesticide activity, research, training and technical assistance, other pest management activities); and (c) geographical region (the United States, less developed countries, and extraterritorial global areas.) AID activities will include development assistance through land and grant programs of technical assistance and training.
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA HEW DOI USCG DOT EPA CEQ
international organizations
foreign governments
(ELR ORDER # 70593)

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Contact: Dr. Peter Krenkel
Director of Environmental Planning
720 Edney Building
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401
(615) 755-3161

Draft	Date
Yellow Creek Nuclear Plant	05/31

Mississippi
County: Tishomingo

The proposed action is the construction and operation of a 2-unit nuclear plant in Tishomongo County, Mississippi. Baseloaded coal-fired and nuclear fueled units would help meet the 1985-1986 peak load. There would be a slight increase in terarperature of water returned to Pickwick Lake. Fish larvae drawn into the closed cooling system could result in reductions of some adult and juvenile fish stocks in Yellow Creek embayment.
(ELR ORDER # 70670)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Contact:
Mr. Martin Convisser, Director
Office of Environmental Affairs
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-4357

Federal Aviation Administration

Draft	Date
Hollywood-Burbank Airport	05/09

California
Proposed is the public acquisition and continued operation of the existing Hollywood-Burbank Airport. Lockheed Air Terminal, Inc., the current owner/operator, has given notice that it will close the airport to public use, and divest itself of the airport facility. The alternatives to public acquisition and operation of the airport consist of two basic options: "No Action", and the substitution of "Alternative Transportation Modes" for the transportation functions presently seved by the Airport.
(Western Region)
(ELR ORDER # 70572)

Babelthuap-Koror Airport	05/31

U.S. Territory
The proposed actions are the improvement and development of the Babelthuap-Koror Airport, Babelthuap Island, Palau District, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Project plans call for realignment of the existing 6,000-foot runway, construction of a 7,200 X 150-foot paved runway, establishment of a runway safety area on each end of the runway, and construction of a Crash/Fire Rescue Equipment Building. Adverse impacts will affect the terrestrial wildlife and vegetation of the airport area and the marine life of the 30-acre area of Airai Bay due to the excavation and grading required, and the draglining of coralline limestone materials.
(ELR ORDER # 70681)

Final Date

Akhiok Airport, Alaska 05/31

Alaska
This statement refers to proposed construction of the Akhiok Airport, Alaska. The project will consist of a 100' X 2000' parking apron, a 20' X 1,325' access road, and a 50' X 50' graded area for a snow removal equipment storage building. The most severe environmental impact will be the destruction of ground cover on land used for the runway.
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70678)

Guam International Airport 05/23

Guam
The proposed action involves the transfer of 67.85 acres of U.S. Navy land to the Government of Guam for the development and expansion of the terminal facilities for the the Guam Internation Air Terminal (GIAT) at Agana Naval Air Station. The future development of GIAT will require clearing approximately 64 acres of vegetation, removal of a portion of bird habitat, and alteration of the existing land use pattern around the airport.
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI DOT DOD COE AHP
Guam government agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70625)

Federal Highway Administration

Draft Date

I-630, I-430 -- I-30 05/02

Arkansas
County: Pulaski
The proposed action is the construction of a multi-lane interstate facility in Little Rock, Arkansas. The completed project will be approximately 7.4 miles in length and will connect Interstate Routes 30 and 430. Approximately 2.56 miles of this route have been completed and 2.44 miles are

currently under construction. These portions were designed as a six-lane interstate facility. Adverse effects include the relocation of residences and businesses, and the utilization of approximately 433 acres for the roadway and its right-of-way.
(ELR ORDER # 70541)

I-91 (Hartford-Enfield), I-29 (Windsor-Manchester) 05/03

Connecticut
County: Hartford
This statement presents proposals for the Interstate 91 (I-91) and Interstate 291 (I-291) transportation corridors located in Hartford County, Connecticut. It is proposed to reconstruct I-91 to provide three travel lanes in each direction from I-84 in Hartford to the Massachusetts State Line in Enfield, a distance of 19.5 miles. I-291 is proposed to be constructed as a new limited access expressway providing two travel lanes in each direction between its termini at I-91 and I-86, a distance of 5.9 miles. The construction of either proposal would require the relocation of 97 families and 18 businesses. (Region 1)
(ELR ORDER # 70552)

U.S. 95, Ferdinand - Craigmont 05/31

Idaho
County: Idaho Lewis
Proposed is the construction of U.S. 95 between the cities of Ferdinand and Craigmont in northcentral Idaho. Alternatives range from no major improvement, to several major improvements on, or realignment possibilities from, the present facility. Beginning about .6 mile southeast of Ferdinand, the improvement would continue northwest, terminating approximately .3 mile west of Craigmont. Adverse impacts vary according to the alternate selected.
(Region 10)
(ELR ORDER # 70673)

Lee's Summit Rd. Improve, US 24 -- I-70 05/09

Missouri
County: Jackson
Proposed is the improvement of Lee's Summit/Kiger Roads within the corporate boundary of the City of Independence, Missouri, from U.S. 24 Highway on the north to and including the proposed I-70 diamond interchange on the south. It is a north-south arterial street between Noland Road on the west and M-291 on the east. The existing roadway is two lanes to be improved to four lanes for a length of approximately four miles. Adverse effects include the acquisition of 25.4 acres of land for right-of-way and the relocation of 30 families. (Region 7)
(ELR ORDER # 70560)

ADHS Corridor D, Williamsburg - Pebbles 05/24

Ohio
County: several
The proposed project consists of construction of a new highway, on new right-of-way, approximately 38 miles in length from its western end north of Williamsburg to its eastern end just south of Pebbles, Ohio. The proposed project is a divided, four-lane, limited-access highway. The highway is part of the Appalachian Development Highway System and is an uncompleted segment of Corridor D in Ohio. The project is located in Clermont, Brown, Highland, and Adams Counties. (Region 5)
(ELR ORDER # 70644)

Allegheny Valley Expressway (L.R. 1037, 5D & 5E) 05/24

Pennsylvania
County: Allegheny
The proposed action is the construction of L.R. 1037-5D and 5E, the Allegheny Valley Expressway, from Bailies Run Road in East Deer Township, northward through Tarentum Borough, to Burtner Road in Harrison Township. This 4-lane limited access facility is approximately 3 miles long. Included in this proposed action is a fully directional interchange with Bull Creek Road, the widening and relocation of Bull Creek Road, and the relocation of Bull Creek and Little Bull Creek. The expressway would result in the elimination of 200 acres of vegetation and the loss of various wildlife species. (Region 3)
(ELR ORDER # 70635)

Everett Bypass 05/26

Pennsylvania
County: Bedford
The proposed action is the construction of the Everett Bypass in Bedford County, Pennsylvania. The project consists of 2.5 miles of relocated U.S. 30 in conjunction with a 2.5 mile relocation of Pennsylvania Traffic Route 26 north of the Everett Borough business district. The U.S. 30 relocation will be a 4-lane divided highway with limited access and the T.R. 26 relocation will be a 2-lane highway with free access. Adverse impacts include the displacement of 60 to 76 residential dwellings and 19 to 34 businesses, depending on the alternate selected.
(Region 3)
(ELR ORDER # 70649)

S.R. 42, Algood Bypass - Livingston Bypass 05/12

Tennessee
County: Overton Putnam
Proposed is the construction of State Route 42 in Putnam

and Overton Counties, Tennessee. The 13-mile project begins at the proposed Algood Bypass and extends in a northeasterly direction on new location to south of the Livingston Bypass. Plans call for construction of a 4-lane divided highway on a minimum right-of-way width of 250' utilizing various proposed typical roadway sections. Adverse effects include displacement of residences, loss of natural habitat, introduction of a new source of noise and air pollution, and temporary siltation of all involved streams during construction. (Region 4)
(ELR ORDER # 70577)

I-640, S.R. 33 - I-40 05/31

Tennessee
County: Knoxville
Proposed is construction of a segment of I-640 in Knoxville County, Tennessee. This segment completes the circumferential route between I-40 on the west side of Knoxville and I-40 on Knoxville's eastern side. The facility is a divided highway having three 12-foot traffic lanes in each direction, 12 feet of stabilized shoulders, and a varying median width. Adverse impacts are displacement of 87 families and 6 businesses, and introduction of a localized source of air and noise pollution. (Region 4)
(ELR ORDER # 70672)

S.R. 2, Fobes Hill - N. Monroe Interchange 05/24

Washington
County: Snohomish
Proposed is the construction of 12.3 miles of State Route 2 to a four-lane highway, with fully controlled limited access, from Fobes Hill, east of Everett and the Snohomish River, to approximately one mile east of Monroe, entirely within Snohomish County. The proposal includes plans for a rest area for each direction of travel, and interchanges at seven locations to provide access to local roads and other state highways. Adverse effects include the loss of forested land and agricultural land both to the highway and to increasing development in rural areas. (Region 10)
(ELR ORDER # 70645)

Final Date

State Routes 41 and 180, Fresno, California 05/24

California
County: Fresno
The project consists of construction of a freeway-expressway system, within the urban area of Fresno, California, to replace existing State Routes 180 and 41. The new routes will be on entirely new alignments, forming a circulation triangle around the Central Business District with distribution links reaching into the northern and eastern

sections of the city. The project will require the relocation of businesses and families and the disruption of neighborhood stability. (Region 9)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI USDA
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70639)

SE Extension of S.R. 9-A,I-95/295-Jacksonville 05/26

Florida
County: Duval
Proposed is the construction of an eastern bypass around the city of Jacksonville, Florida. The multi-lane, high speed, limited access facility will begin at the south I-95/I-295 Interchange and proceed northerly to the St. John River, terminating at the I-95/I-295 Interchange north of Jacksonville. The project also includes plans for a high-level bridge. Depending on the alternate corridor selected, project length will be from 23.5 to 28.9 miles. Adverse effects include relocation of homes and businesses, loss of forest resources, filling of wetlands, and alteration of wildlife habitat. (Region 4)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI USDA USCG DOT DOC
state and local agencies
interested parties
(ELR ORDER # 70652)

Freeway 592, Polk and Warren Counties, Iowa 05/24

Iowa
County: Polk Warren
Proposed is the construction of Freeway 592 in Polk and Warren Counties, Iowa. The project begins at I-35 west of Des Moines in the vicinity of Iowa 5, and extends eastward to the vicinity of the junction of Iowa 5 and Iowa 46 near Avon. The major effects of the action include diversion of approximately 582 acres of quality farmland to highway right-of-way, and the dislocation of an estimated 15 individuals from their homes and farmsteads. (Region 7)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOI HEW EPA DOT UMTA
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70640)

Md. Route 2 & 4, New Patuxent R. Bridge - S.R. 235 05/24

Maryland
County: St. Mary's
The proposed action entails the initial construction of a two-lane highway on new alignment from the southern approaches of the Lower Patuxent River Bridge to Maryland Route 235 in St. Mary's County. Right-of-way acquisition is proposed for an ultimate dual four-lane facility separated by a 30-foot wide grass median. The initial and ultimate facilities will provide partial control of access. Due to the rural character of the Study Area,

losses in wildlife habitat and removal of vegetation would result from project construction. (Region 3)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI USDA EPA
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70629)

South Midtown Freeway (Route 71) 05/20

Missouri
County: Jackson
The proposed 10.2 mile highway improvement consists of an 8-lane freeway, constructed on a new location with limited access right-of-way from the Interchange of Route I-35 - I-70 in the downtown loop to 95th Street, Jackson County, in Kansas City, Missouri. Approximately 1630 individuals have been relocated and 1650 more will be displaced. Thirteen school districts and nine fire districts will be affected by the improvement. A 4(f) statement is included for Spring Valley Park and Hagerwood Park. (Region 7)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI USDA EPA COE DOT USCG
State and local agencies
(ELR ORDER #70616)

US 81 and US 30, Columbus, Nebraska 05/12

Nebraska
County: Polk Butler Platte
The project consists of the improvement of two separate roadways, US 81 and US 30 south of Columbus, and L-71-D, US 81 to US 30 connection, in the city of Columbus. The improvement includes the construction of new bridges over Platte and Loup Rivers as well as over various creeks and drainageways. The project will require the acquisition of 50 acres of land for right-of-way and the displacement of families and businesses. A 4(f) statement concerning Pawnee Park is included.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOT USAF COE USDA DOI EPA
(ELR ORDER # 70580)

I-590, Rochester Outer Loop 05/23

New York
County: Monroe
Proposed is the construction of 4.24 miles of I-590 (the Rochester Outer Loop) between Scottsville Road in the town of Chili and Winton Road in the town of Brighton. The recommended alternative will require 10.2 acres of Genesee Valley Park, although no active recreation area will be affected. Noise and air pollution levels in the project area will increase.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOT USCG USDA DOC HEW DOI EPA AHP
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70622)

U.S. 2, Leeds to Churches Ferry 05/24

North Dakota
County: Benson
Proposed is the construction of a road paralleling the existing road to provide a 11.5 mile, 4-lane divided segment of U.S. 2 from Leeds to Churches Ferry. The project will displace some agricultural land and land under USFWS Wetlands Easement. Approximately 20 acres of wetland basins will be filled. The action will result in the relocation of 6 families.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOT DOI USDA HUD EPA FEA COE
state agencies
interested parties
(ELR ORDER # 70636)

Midland North Arterial Loop 05/24

Texas
County: Midland
The proposed action will provide for a 4-lane, divided north arterial loop around the City of Midland's urbanized area. The project will extend from the junction of FM 1369 and I-20 west of Midland, north, east and south approximately 17 miles to I-20 east of Midland. Adverse impacts include displacement of families and businesses, increased air and noise pollution, and conversion of pastureland to highway use. (Region 6)
COMMENTS MADE BY: HEW COE USDA EPA
interested parties
(ELR ORDER # 70638)

Mapleton Center Street, Utah 05/09

Utah
County: Utah
Proposed is the improvement and extension of Mapleton Center Street from Maple Street to Hobble Creek Canyon Road, a distance of 1.5 miles.Bituminous surface will cover 2 12-foot lanes and 2 8-foot shoulders, for a total width of 40 feet. Adverse impacts include the relocation of 3 families and construction disruption resulting especially from a cut and fill section and structure for Hobbel Creek.

COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI USDA EPA HUD DOC HEW AHP
state agencies
interested parties
(ELR ORDER # 70558)

SR 14, Kennewick Vicinity 05/31

Washington
County: Benton

The project consists of the construction of an additional two lanes of SR 14 for a 4.8 mile length in Kennewick, Washington. Adverse impacts resulting from the construction will include the use of 2 acres of land for additional rights-of-way, the loss of 15 acres of wildlife habitat, increased traffic in the area, and increase in noise and air pollution during construction. (Region 10)
COMMENTS MADE BY: COE EPA DOI USDA HUD
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70674)

Daly Avenue Route, Wisconsin Rapids 05/02

Wisconsin
County: Wood
The proposed action involves construction of an urban, four-lane divided street located within the city limits of Wisconsin Rapids, Wisconsin. The project termini are the intersection of West Grand Avenue (S.T.H. 13,73) on the west and Eighth Street (S.T.H. 13) on the east. Project length is approximately two miles. The construction will require acquisition of two acres of right-of-way. A 4(f) statement is included concerning encroachment upon Lyons and Demitz parks. (Region 5)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOT DOI EPA HEW COE
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70544)

Oneida St. Bridge and Approaches, Appleton 05/09

Wisconsin
County: Outgamie
The proposed project involves the construction of a new bridge across the Fox River and a Government Lock Canal and its approaches in the City of Appleton. The bridge, located 600' west of the present Oneida Street crossing, would be four lanes wide and .67 mile long. The construction of the north approach roadways will require the acquisition of a portion of Jones Park (a 4(f) statement is included) and the south approach will sever the practice area of Riverview Country Club's golf course. Three residences will be relocated, one warehouse will be acquired, and Peerless Point Co. will be displaced by construction. (Region 5)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USCG DOI COE USDA HEW EPA
state and local agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70561)

Supplement Date

S.R. 44, San Ysidro-north (S-2) 05/24

New Mexico

County: Sandoval
The proposed project consists of upgrading a 2-lane section of State Road 44 from 2.6 miles south of San Ysidro north in Sandoval County, New Mexico. Alternatives consist of moving the alignment several hundred feet west across the reservation line, moving it a quarter of a mile west to miss the large ruins off the reservation, or follow the old alignment and widen the right-of-way to the east. Adverse effects include change in land use for about 50 acres of new right-of-way. (Region 6)
(ELR ORDER # 70632)

US 18-151 Corridor,Dodgeville-Mt. Horeb (S-1) 05/02

Wisconsin
County: Dane Iowa
This statement supplements two final approved EISs for proposed highway improvements in the USH 18-151 corridor extending from the Dodgeville area to the Mt. Horeb area. The first statement discussed impacts for the 21 mile segment between Dodgeville and Mt. Horeb, while the second statement discussed impacts for a bypass of Mt. Horeb, a segment of about 3.6 miles. This supplement incorporates additional studies subsequently undertaken, as directed by the Wisconsin Highway Commission, and addresses the following issues of public concern: land conservation, project cost, local service, and staging potentials.
(ELR ORDER # 70539)

Urban Mass Transportation Administration

Draft Date

Buffalo Light Rail Rapid Transit 05/26

New York
County: Erie Niagara
The Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority of New York has filed an application with UMTA for Federal capital grant assistance to construct and equip a 6.4-mile Light Rail Rapid Transit (LRRT) System along Main Street in the Buffalo-Amherst Corridor, New York. The LRRT would run in subway for 5.2 miles between the South Campus of the State University, and at grade for 1.2 miles from Tupper Street to Buffalo's Memorial Auditorium. The action will result in displacement of 21 parcels and the razing of 8 structures.
(ELR ORDER # 70657)

U.S.Coast Guard

Contact:
Captain Frederick P. Schubert
Office of Marine Environment and Systems
U.S. Coast Guard
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-2010

Draft	Date
Tanker Regs - Double Bottoms, Segregated Ballast	05/13

Proposed are certain changes in regulations related to two earlier rulemakings that were issued under Title II of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972. The regulatory changes would apply segregated ballast requirements to tank vessels both new and existing of 20,000 deadweight tons or greater and would require that all new tank vessels have double bottom spaces to achieve the required segregated ballast capacity. These regulations would apply to U.S. tankers and to foreign tankers entering U.S. waters. Beneficial impacts are anticipated.
(ELR ORDER # 70587)

Ohio R. Bridge & US 22, WVa.-Ohio 05/20

Ohio West Virginia

The proposed action is the granting of a U.S. Coast Guard permit for construction of a toll-free bridge and approaches in Ohio and West Virginia. The 2.5-mile project begins at a connection to existing US 22 (Stoney Hollow Boulevard) in Steubenville, Jefferson County, Ohio, and continues across the Ohio River to Main Street (US 22 and WV 2) in Weirton, Brooke County, West Virginia. Two alternate locations were considered: 1) a site across the Ohio River at Alikanna, and 2) an alignment in which the West Virginia approach would be the same but the Ohio approach would be skewed to the north. The action will result in the relocation of 63 families and 6 businesses.
(ELR ORDER # 70615)

U. S. POSTAL SERVICE

Contact: Emerson Smith, Director
Office of Buildings Analysis
and Design
Real Estate and Buildings Department
U.S. Postal Service
Washington, D.C. 20260
(202) 245-4242

Final	Date
Rochester General Mail Facility	05/24

New York
County: Monroe
Proposed is the construction of a new General Mail Facility on a 44-acre site on Jefferson Road in the Town of Henrietta. The new facility would consolidate the mail handling and sorting operations now carried out at four U.S. Postal Service facilities in the Rochester area: the Main Post Office and Vehicle Maintenance Facility at 216 Cumberland Street in downtown Rochester; the Sectional Center Facility located in Henrietta; and two postal branch offices, also located in Henrietta. A transfer of 1062 jobs from the City of Rochester to the Town of Henrietta will result.
COMMENTS MADE BY: HEW EPA
state and city agencies
concerned citizens
(ELR ORDER # 70637)

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

Contact:

(For Housing Programs)
Mr. Lyman T. Miller
Assistant Director for Construction and Valuation
Veterans Administration
810 Vermont Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20420
(202) 389-2691
(For all other programs)
Mr. Nicholas Clark, Civil Engineer
Technical Services Division
Engineering Service
Veterans Administration
Washington, D.C. 20420
(202) 389-2086

Draft	Date
V.A. Replacement Hospital, Richmond	05/19

Virginia
Proposed is the construction of an 820-bed Replacement Veterans Administration Hospital to be located on the existing 130-acre Veterans Administration property in Richmond, Virginia. The proposed new construction will replace a functionally inadequate and outmoded facility presently existing at the Veterans Administration Hospital, Richmond. Adverse effects include impacts on soil erosion and increased dust and noise levels.
(ELR ORDER # 70606)

Summary of 102 Statements Filed with the CEQ Through 5/31/77 (By Agency)

Agency	Draft 102's for actions on which no final 102's have yet been received	Final 102's on legislation and actions	Supplements	Total actions on which draft or final statements have been received
Agriculture, Department of	188	810	7	1005
Appalachian Regional Commission	1	0	0	1
Architect of the Capitol	0	1	0	1
Atomic Energy Commission	42	144	0	186
Canal Zone Government	0	1	0	1
Civil Aeronautics Board	0	2	0	2
Commerce, Department of	24	74	3	101
Consumer Product Safety Commission	0	1	0	1
Defense, Department of	10	8	1	19
Air Force	11	27	2	40
Army	4	29	2	35
Army Corps of Engineers	557	1132	32	1721
Navy	14	43	2	59
Deleware River Basin Commission	2	8	0	10
Energy Policy Office	0	1	0	1
Energy Research & Development Admin.	9	9	0	18
Environmental Protection Agency	52	110	2	164
Federal Energy Administration	10	9	2	21
Federal Maritime Commission	3	0	0	3
Federal Power Commission	81	68	5	154
Federal Trade Commission	1	0	0	1
General Services Administration	19	108	3	130
HEW, Department of	3	18	0	21
HUD, Department of	84	264	4	352
Interior, Department of	156	396	6	558
International Boundary and Water Commission -- U.S. and Mexico	0	10	0	10
Interstate Commerce Commission	9	15	0	24
Justice, Department of	2	3	0	5
Labor, Department of	5	5	0	10
National Aeronautics and Space Adm.	11	25	3	39
National Capitol Planning Comm.	5	8	0	13
National Science Foundation	0	7	0	7
New England River Basins Commission	3	0	0	3
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	8	42	9	59
Office of Science and Technology	0	1	0	1
Ohio River Basin Commission	0	1	0	1
Pacific Northwest River Basins Comm.	3	0	0	3
Pennsylvania Ave. Devel. Corp.	0	1	0	1
Souris-Red-Rainy River Basins Comm.	1	0	0	1
State Department	3	6	0	9
Tennessee Valley Authority	9	29	0	38
Transportation, Department of	1023	2309	24	3356
Treasury, Department of	4	7	0	11
Upper Mississippi River Basin Comm.	1	0	0	1
U.S. Postal Service	3	4	0	7
U.S. Water Resources Council	7	9	0	16
Veterans Administration	4	9	0	13
TOTALS	2372	5754	107	8233

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
722 JACKSON PLACE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006

102 Monitor

The 102 Monitor is the monthly publication of the Council on Environmental Quality. In addition to its listing of environmental impact statements which have been filed with the Council under the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Monitor contains a list of EPA's comments, filed under the provisions of section 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended; items of current concern in NEPA case law; and information on the environmental studies of the Council.

The 102 Monitor is printed and distributed by the Government Printing Office. The subscription rate for the Monitor is $21.50 annually, with an additional $5.40 charge for foreign mailing; individual copies of the Monitor are $1.80 from GPO.

Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

(Difficulties in obtaining copies of the 102 Monitor should be referred to GPO's Service Section, (SSOS) Washington, D.C. 20402)

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

ENTER MY SUBSCRIPTION TO: 102 MONITOR (MN'T)

@ $21.50 Domestic; @ $26.90 Foreign.

NAME—FIRST, LAST

COMPANY NAME OR ADDITIONAL ADDRESS LINE

STREET ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

(or) COUNTRY

PLEASE PRINT

☐ Remittance Enclosed (Make checks payable to Superintendent of Documents)

☐ Charge to my Deposit Account No. ....

MAIL ORDER FORM TO:
Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402